

GRADUATE SCHOOL . THE CHINESE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG

THE JUVENILE PROBATION VERSUS THE POLICE DISCRETIONARY SCHEME
A Comparative Study of
Two Treatment Programmes for Fresh Offenders
by
Yeung Yuen-on, Thomas

Thesis Submitted in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Social Work

May, 1979

thesis
HV
9213
A5Y47
1

954994



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grateful acknowledgement is made of the willing co-operation given by the Probation Division, Social Welfare Department, and the Juvenile Protection Unit, the Royal Hong Kong Police Force. A special word of gratitude is expressed for the trouble taken by all officers concerned in providing research material on which this project is based. Without their help, no study would have been possible.

The writer is most grateful for the guidance and advice of his supervisor, Professor John F. Jones. This thesis can not have been accomplished without his continual support. And, to all those who have given their insights on the subject of juvenile delinquency, the writer is indebted to their advice and support.

Finally, the writer would also like to express appreciation to his family members for their kindness, patience and the many helpful suggestions they have made.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this pilot study is to initiate an investigation on the comparative effectiveness of two treatment programmes for fresh offender. Taking into the consideration of the pros and cons of various measuring indices, social adjustment is adopted in this study as the criterion to measure the programme effectiveness. Since this study is to explore the comparative effectiveness of two treatment programmes rather than the assessment of a single programme, comparative method is used to collect and to analyse the data.

The population under study is 121 probation cases and 132 police discretionary cases which have successfully completed the treatment during the period of January 1, 1977 to December 31, 1977. Among these cases, thirty cases are drawn from each treatment programme and they are drawn in such a way that the background characteristics of the two sample groups are as alike as possible. These background characteristics include sex, age, educational level, nature of offence committed, previous conviction, family income and parental integrity.

During the process of data collection, there are a number of non-responding cases. So, data finally obtained

reduces the sample size to twenty cases in each treatment programme. The writer hopes that by comparing the social adjustment of these two groups of juveniles, he may find out which treatment programme is more effective in dealing with the fresh juvenile offenders. Further, in order to establish also a standard of social adjustment for the study, a third comparison group is included. This third comparison group is a non-offender group matches closely with the major intervening factors controlled in the two treatment groups.

As for data collection, a multi-dimensional instrument is developed to measure the social adjustment of the offenders. Four different areas which the writer perceives most relevant to the adjustment problem of a delinquent are covered in the instrument. They include the adjustment in family relationships, social relationship, conformity and emotional stability.

There are two ways that the findings of this study may be summarized and interpreted. First of all, from the data gathered on social adjustment, no significant difference is reported between the two treatment groups with regard to the adjustment for family relationships, social relationships, conformity and emotional stability. Though

there is a tendency for the adjustment scores to be somewhat higher among the probation sample group, the difference is not at a statistical significant level. This may imply that the treatment effect to those fresh offenders are more or less the same for both treatment programmes.

Secondly, when comparing the adjustment scores of the two treatment groups with the non-offender group, three out of the four dimensions under investigation show no significant difference. The only exception is the dimension of conformity. In other words, the finding suggests that the outcomes of both treatment programmes are, to a certain extent, satisfactory. As to those offenders who have predominantly conformity problem, some other alternative measures should be tried.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Local Scene of Juvenile Delinquency	
	The Problem	
	The Scope of Study	
II.	THEORETICAL ORIENTATION.....	9
	Review of literatures	
	The theoretical framework	
	General hypothesis	
	Definition of variables and sub-hypotheses	
III.	THE RESEARCH DESIGN.....	31
	The research methodology	
	Control of intervening variables	
	The sample groups	
	Sampling procedure	
	Sample characteristics	
	The measuring instrument	
	Data collection	
	Statistical analysis of the data	
IV.	FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS: THE ADJUSTMENT IN FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS.....	54
	Parent-child relationship	
	Siblings' relationship	
	Family conflict	
	Family attachment	
	Family control	
	Family acceptance	
	Summary	
V.	FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS: THE ADJUSTMENT IN SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS.....	71
	Sociability	
	Social participation	
	Summary	

Chapter .

VI. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS: CONFORMITY..... 80

 Anti-institutionalized norm

 Conforming to parental guidance

 Rebellious

 Immediate gratification

 Anti-authority

 Anti-regulation

 Summary

VII. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS: EMOTIONAL STABILITY..... 97

 Emotional deprivation

 Depression

 Mood fluctuation

 Aggression

 Anxiety

 Summary

VIII. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS.....113

 Implications

 Limitations of the study

IX. CONCLUSION.....121

APPENDIX ONE - The adjustment scale (in English)..124

APPENDIX TWO - The adjustment scale (in Chinese)..130

APPENDIX THREE - Letter to the respondents.....133

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....135

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Age Distribution of the Respondents.....	43
3.2	Sex Distribution of the Respondents.....	44
3.3	Income of the Respondents' family.....	46
3.4	Educational Level of the Respondents.....	47
3.5	Offences Committed by the Respondents.....	48
4.1	Responses of Question No.25.....	56
4.2	Responses of Question No.27.....	57
4.3	Responses of Question No.4.....	59
4.4	Responses of Question No.24.....	59
4.5	Responses of Question No.2.....	61
4.6	Responses of Question No.33.....	61
4.7	Responses of Question No.7.....	63
4.8	Responses of Question No.10.....	64
4.9	Responses of Question No.13.....	65
4.10	Responses of Question No.18.....	66
4.11	Responses of Question No.5.....	68
4.12	Scores for the Family Adjustment Scale of the Three Samples.....	69
5.1	Responses of Question No.11.....	73
5.2	Responses of Question No.19.....	74
5.3	Responses of Question No.32.....	75
5.4	Responses of Question No.16.....	76

Table		Page
5.5	Responses of Question No.30.....	77
5.6	Responses of Question No.34.....	78
5.7	Scores for the Adjustment Scale for Social Relationship.....	79
6.1	Responses of Question No.8.....	82
6.2	Responses of Question No.31.....	83
6.3	Responses of Question No.3.....	85
6.4	Responses of Question No.35.....	87
6.5	Responses of Question No.21.....	89
6.6	Responses of Question No.28.....	91
6.7	Responses of Question No.36.....	92
6.8	Responses of Question No.14.....	93
6.9	Responses of Question No.23.....	94
6.10	Scores for the Adjustment Scale for Conformity.....	95
7.1	Responses of Question No.15.....	99
7.2	Responses of Question No.17.....	100
7.3	Responses of Question No.29.....	101
7.4	Responses of Question No.22.....	102
7.5	Responses of Question No.9.....	103
7.6	Responses of Question No.20.....	105
7.7	Responses of Question No.26.....	106
7.8	Responses of Question No.6.....	107

Table		Page
7.9	Responses of Question No.1.....	109
7.10	Responses of Question No.12.....	110
7.11	Scores for the Adjustment Scale for Educational Stability.....	112

Emotional.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. THE LOCAL SCENE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

In pre-war and during the first decade after liberation, juvenile crime in Hong Kong was not as serious as present. The portion of young offenders was very small and their misdeeds mostly trivial.¹ However, at that time, the young offenders were treated as adult criminals. After they were convicted before court, they were sentenced to prison and stayed together with the adult offenders.

From the mid-fifties and the mid-sixties, Hong Kong had witnessed a great economic transformation. Many branches of industries, such as textile and plastic industries, appeared and developed rapidly. People from rural area started to move into urban district to seek for

¹The Police Annual Departmental Report 1955/56 showed that there were totally 12014 persons arrested in the year of 1955. Among these offenders, only 445 were under sixteen years old. Furthermore, a majority of these juvenile offenders (364 in actual figure) were arrested for an offence of larceny. These figures are drawn from the Police Annual Department Report 1955/56, (Hong Kong: Government Printer 1956), p.61-62.

better living. Following closely with industrialization and urbanization, many problems such as unemployment, housing, water supply and transportation emerged. Efforts had quickly been made to cope with these social problems but the people in Hong Kong seemed to have neglected the fact that there was also a marked increase of juvenile crime.

The rise of juvenile crime began in 1959 when 1259 juveniles were arrested. They represented 10% of the total number of police actions taken against criminals. This number increased to 1612 in 1965 which represented 19% of the total number of prosecutions. Though the juvenile crime rate had markedly increased when compared with the figures in the previous years, the Hong Kong Government inclined to deny the existence of the delinquency problem.² It was not until late sixties that the delinquency problem turned out to be an issue of public concern. The crime

²The Government's attitude is reflected in the conclusion of a report made by a working party set up in 1964 to find out whether the legislation is adequate enough for the court to deal with crime of violence committed by young offenders. The working party denied juvenile delinquency as a special problem that needed immediate attention. They tried to explain that the increase of juvenile offence was due to the change of the young population structure in Hong Kong

statistic began to foster a belief that Hong Kong was experiencing a "crime Wave".³ At that moment, both the government and the citizens came to aware that juvenile delinquency was an important problem threatening the security of people in Hong Kong. They also realized that the existing measures were insufficient to solve the problem. Under such circumstances, they started to seek new ways to check the wide spread of delinquency in Hong Kong.

II. THE PROBLEM

During the past years, the Hong Kong Government has devised many treatment programmes to rehabilitate the young offenders. However, as criticized by Lethbridge, these treatment programmes in Hong Kong are "in a state of flux".⁴ They develop in two contradictory directions. On the one end, some treatment programmes are liberally oriented, emphasizing the humanitarian approach. This

³The commissioner of Police also admitted in his 1969/70 Annual Report that there had been a noticable increase of number young people being prosecuted.

⁴H.J. Lethbridge, "Penal Policy and Crime Rate: Comments on the Hong Kong Experience," Hong Kong Law Journal, No. 2, (1972), p. 59.

can be seen by the extensive use of the probation service.⁵ On the other end, there is a conservative approach emphasizing the deterrent measure. This approach can be exemplified by the rapid development of the Detention Center Project.⁶

Although these programmes differ sharply in the method of dealing with the juvenile delinquents, they all claim to have a very high success rate. For example, the Police Discretionary Scheme claims to have an average success rate of 95%; the probation division states that their success rate is in the range of 80%; and the Detention Center Project has an average success rate of 90%.⁷ Judging merely from these figures, all these treatment programmes are impressed to be equally effective. However, the picture is not so simple as they have declared. To borrow Martin Gold's criticism, the treatment programmes in Hong Kong are "guided by beliefs that are more nearly articles of faith than cogent theories and the observation on its effects are

⁵During the past ten years (1967-1976), the probation treatment programme had rendered counselling service to 17614 probationers.

⁶Since the inception of the Detention Center Project, 2767 young offenders were admitted to the Detention Center.

⁷These figures are the average of the success rates shown in the annual reports of the above three departments in the past ten years.

more influence by wish than by fact."⁸ During the past decade, little have been learnt from the many efforts undertaken to reduce delinquency in Hong Kong because the programmes have rarely been evaluated scientifically. Even when some evaluative studies were conducted on a few programmes, the methods of assessment relied mostly on statistical figures supplied for administration purpose. As a result, although all the treatment programmes claim to have a very high success rate, we are uncertain that which of these treatment programmes will be more effective in reducing delinquency. If we want to improve the correctional service in Hong Kong and to solve the delinquency problem more effectively, we must find out which type of treatment method is most appropriate. This should be an urgent and indispensable task because the correctional workers in Hong Kong are working in a situation where they are short of time, funds, tools, facilities and trained staff to render the correctional services professionally. The application of the inappropriate treatment programme may result in, if not a negative result, a waste of manpower,

⁸Martin Gold, "Crime and Delinquency: Control and Prevention," Encyclopedia of Social Work,

funds or facilities. We cannot afford to waste time or under-utilize the facilities to wait passively for the staff to gain insights in ways that they can put their programmes in full strength. Thus, the treatment programmes to cope with the delinquency in Hong Kong should be undertaken in the context of scientific study to help us to become more certain of what we are doing.

In view of the above discussion, the purpose of the present study is to initiate an exploration on whether there is any significant difference between the outcomes of treatment programmes for juvenile delinquency. By doing this, the writer hopes that the findings can provide some stimulations to the workers in the correctional field so that they can make a better use of their treatment programmes. Furthermore, it may also provide adequate background knowledge for future research.

III. THE SCOPE OF STUDY

Owing to time and manpower limitation, it is too broad a scope for the writer to conduct a study to cover all treatment programmes. In this study, the writer has focused his attention on the treatment of fresh offenders while two specific treatment programmes, namely the Police Discretionary

Scheme and the Probation Treatment Programme, are chosen as the targets for the present exploration. There are two major reasons that these two treatment programmes are chosen. Firstly, they are both treatment programmes dealing with juvenile fresh offenders. Secondly, the writer has special interest in studying the treatment programme for fresh offenders because they are deemed to be the major source of further delinquency. Treatment for fresh offenders are in a real sense preventive as well, because the ultimate goal is to deter them from committing further offences. If we can keep these known delinquents from repeating their misdeeds at an early phase, we may at the same time reduce the greatest potential source of delinquency. In this light, treatment programme for fresh offenders deserves some priority.

Secondly, in order to control some foreseeable intervening variables, the writer attempts to explore the outcomes of two treatment programmes which have maximum similarity in their clients' background, treatment objectives and degree of deviance etc. Taking this factor into consideration, the Juvenile Discretionary Scheme operated by the police and the Probation Treatment Programme conducted by social workers are chosen because they have similar client group

and their treatment goals resembles one another.⁹

⁹ Their clients are similar in a sense that they are both fresh offenders who are under sixteen years of age. These two differs in that the probationers are brought up to court for minor offences while, in contrast, the police supervisees are placed under discretioary scheme in cases where the victims agree not to take any prosecution against the offenders. Though both the probationers and the police supervisees are deemd not yet deep-rooted delinquents, they are both found to have inclinations towards further deviance and are considered to be in need of guidance services.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

I. REVIEW OF LITERATURES

There are various methods to adjudge the effectiveness of a treatment programme, and each of them has its own strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, as a preliminary step of the present research, it will be worthwhile to carry out a review of literatures describing the effectiveness of the two treatment programmes that we are going to study. Their research methods and findings may give us some guidelines to build up our own design.

From the literatures available, the effectiveness of the two treatment programmes are found most frequently measured by one of the following criteria: the reconviction rate, the degree of social adjustment and the personality change. Some examples are quoted as follows:-

First, many researchers regard the prevention of crime as the goal of their treatment programmes. Sticking to this specific objective, they assess the results of their

treatment programmes in terms of reconviction rate. In a study conducted by Caldwell, the effectiveness of the probation treatment programme in Alabama was measured by the reconviction rate of a sample of 403 exprobationers. He found that 94% of the subject under studied were free from felony convictions while 84% were free from any kind of reconviction.¹⁰ Later, a survey on the result of probation conducted by the Cambridge University, department of criminal science, using a similar approach showed that 2/3 of the men and 1/2 of the boys completed the probation and stayed clean in the following three years without breaking the law.¹¹ In another follow-up study conducted by England, the researcher justified his use of reconviction rate to assess the effectiveness of the probation treatment programme from a legal point of view.¹² He found that 17.7%

¹⁰ Morris G. Caldwell, "Review of a New Type of Probation Study Made in Alabama," Federal Probation, (June, 1951).

¹¹ L. Radzinowicz, ed., The Result of Probation-A Report of the Cambridge Department Of Criminal Science, (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. 1958.)

¹² From his point of view, it is the public officials that declare an offender guilty of a criminal act, and order him dealt with in way designed to prevent further violation. So, only the findings of public officials should be used to decide whether or not the intent of the earlier dealings was fulfilled.

of the five hundred exprobationers were again convicted within the five years after the expiry of their probation orders.¹³ All the above mentioned studies inclined to imply that probation treatment was a rather effective treatment programme because all their findings showed a rather low reconviction rate. However, these researches failed to find out whether the probation treatment was the most appropriate measure as no comparison was made to other treatment programmes.

To solve this problem, Wilkins adopted a comparative approach in assessing the result of probation. Using the reconviction rate as the measuring criterion, he compared a group of thirty-one probationers with thirty-one individually matched offenders receiving other types of court sentence.¹⁴ Examining the post-treatment records within the following three years, Wilkins found that there was no significant difference between the two groups. Among the thirty-one

¹³Ralph W. England, "A Study of Postprobation Recidivism Among Five Hundred Federal Offenders," Federal Probation, (September, 1955), pp. 10-16.

¹⁴These court sentences included imprisonment, fine, discharge, borstal and approval school treatment.

probationers, seventeen probationers were able to stay away from further trouble while the rest relapsed to crime during the period under studied. This led to a success rate of 54.8%. As to the matching group, eighteen offenders led a law-abiding living while thirteen offenders ran into further troubles. This result gave a success rate of 58.1%. By comparing the success rates of the above treatment approaches, Wilkins concluded that the probation treatment was at least as effective in preventing recidivism as the institutional treatment.¹⁵ However, if the data of the matching group is further broken down according to the types of court sentences, we will find that the success rate of institutional treatment turns out to be even lower. Among the twenty-four offenders receiving institutional treatment, only half of them managed to stay away from further troubles. On the other hand, the success rate of the non-custodial treatment raises to 85.7%. (Among the seven offenders that were disposed by court with fine or absolute discharge, only one was reconvicted.) In other words, allowing that there are differences in the degree of deviance to those offenders, the probation treatment is better than the institutional sentence but is less effective when compares with non-custodial sentences.

¹⁵ L.T. Wilkins, "A Small Comparative Study of the Results of Probation," British Journal of Delinquency, V. 8, (1958)pp. 201-9.

Martin was not a correctional worker but he was also interested in comparing the effectiveness of probation with other treatment methods.¹⁶ From the standpoint of a citizen and a tax payer, he measured the effectiveness of a treatment programmes in terms of how the treatment programmes could reduce the amount of public funds spent in correctional work without taking greater risk in the security of the community. In other words, his major concern was to find out whether the extensive use of probation treatment programme, which is a cheaper way to deal with offenders, could obtain a similar success rate when compared with the previous sentencing pattern. In the Saginaw Project, he compared the percentage of the probation cases and subsequent success-failure rate three years prior to and three years after the project.¹⁷

During the first period prior to the project, namely between July 1, 1954 and June 30, 1957, a total of

¹⁶ John B. Martin is the chairman of Michigan Crime and Delinquency Council, National Council on Crime and Delinquency. All the members of this council are not correctional workers. Hence, this research conducted them should be able to be free from professional bias.

¹⁷ John B. Martin, "The Saginaw Project," Crime and Delinquency, V.6. (1960), p. 357.

483 convicted offenders were disposed by court. Probation had been granted to 61% of this number, 34% had been given prison terms, while the remaining 5% had received other dispositions such as fines or county jail sentences. At the same period, Martin found that a total of 172 probation cases ended. Of this number, 32% were reconvicted for the violation of probation while 57% had been discharged with improvement.

Comparing this result with the period after the project had started, namely, from July 1, 1957 to April 1, 1960, Martin found that the probation treatment could be used much more extensively with no greater risk to the safety of the community. It was because within the three years after the inception of the project, among the 403 offenders disposed by court, 68% were granted with probation treatment. It represented an increase of about 7% over the three prior years. About 17% offenders were committed to prison and this was only half the number of imprisonment as in the previous three years. This figures implied that after the inception of the Saginaw Project, the court had made greater use of the probation treatment. Something more important is that the data collected in this period showed that the extensive use of probation treatment had not raised the reconviction rate. During this period, 349 probation cases

Were closed. Among them, only 17% were reconvicted for violation of probation. This represented a reduction in the violation of probation treatment when compared with the prior three years. Furthermore, only 10% probationers were discharged without improvement while 73% of them were discharged with improvement. The latter showed a 16% increase when compared to the previous period. In this light, the probation treatment was deemed to be more effective in a sense that it could save a lot of public funds by replacing some of the institutional cases with probation treatment without increasing the violation rate.

Though all the above researches have indicated that the probation treatment is at least as effective as institutional treatment, their findings are debatable if some extraneous factors are also taken into consideration. For example, the degree of deviance of the offenders in the treatment programme may affect the treatment outcome. Generally speaking, it will be more easy to keep fresh offenders in the right path than to help a deep-rooted criminal to reform. Hence, if the offenders of the treatment programmes differed sharply in this variable, it will be very unfair to assess the effectiveness of the treatment programmes in terms of their reconviction rates.

In order to solve this problem, Babst and Mannering had adopted a more sophisticated method in comparing the effectiveness of probation treatment with imprisonment.¹⁸ In their study, post-release records of 7614 offenders were examined to find out whether they had committed a new offence within two years time. In analysing these data, they found out that when the type of offence committed, criminal record and marital status were held constant, the success rate of probation was about the same as that of imprisonment for recidivists.¹⁹

Hammond had also realized the influence of extraneous factors in comparing the effectiveness of different treatment programmes. However, he adopted an approach different from

¹⁸D.V. Babst and J.W. Mannering, "Probation Vs Imprisonment for Similar Types of Offenders - A Comparison by Subsequent Violation," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 2, (1965), p. 60.

¹⁹For those who had one previous conviction, the violation rate of probation was 41.8% while the violation rate for imprisonment was 43.9%. For those who had more than one previous conviction, the violation rate of probation was 51.8% and the violation rate of the imprisoned group was 48.7%. As to the first offenders, the effect of probation treatment was found better than imprisonment. The violation rate for the probationer was 25% while the violation rate for prisoners was 32.9%.

Babst and Mannering's study.²⁰ Basing on age, type of offence and number of previous conviction, Hammond calculated expected reconviction rates for the sample groups receiving different treatments. Then, he compared these expected reconviction rates with the actual reconviction rates in different treatment programmes so as to obtain an indication on the comparative effectiveness of these treatment programmes. The result of his study also indicated that for the fresh offenders, the effectiveness of probation treatment was about the same as that of other measures for fresh offenders.

All the above mentioned researches stressed primarily on the effectiveness of probation treatment. As for the Police Discretionary Scheme, there is very little literatures available. The reason is that the Police Discretionary Scheme is not a very commonly used treatment method. In fact, it is only an informal way of practice adopted by some police departments in the United Kingdom and this treatment method is only used to deal with young offenders.²¹ Nevertheless, two available researches are

²⁰W.H. Hammond, The Sentence of the Court, A Handbook for Sentencers, (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1969.)

²¹In 1967, there were totally seventeen police districts in England employing this method in dealing with fresh juvenile offenders.

reviewed here for reference.

In 1960, a research was conducted by Mack to explore the comparative effectiveness between the Police Discretionary Scheme and other forms of treatment for first offenders.²² By checking the records of reconvictions of the first offenders, Mack found out that those who were placed under Police Discretionary Scheme had a higher 'non-reconviction rate'. Tracing the records in a period of five years, the offenders under the supervision of the police had a 94% non-reconviction rate for the first year, 84% for the second year, 76% for the third year, 72% for the fourth year and 67% for the fifth year. In contrast, the non-reconviction rate of the other treatment programmes was 89% for the first year, 74% for the second year, 67% for the third year, 62% for the fourth year and 55% for the fifth year. With reference to the above, Mack concluded that the Scheme was an effective measure in dealing with juvenile offenders in terms of less reconviction rate. He further stressed that this police practice had also produced invaluable side-effects by strengthening public confidence in police and reduced the burden of the court cases.

²² J.A. Mack, Police Juvenile Liaison Scheme - Practice and Evaluation, (School of Social Study, University of Glasgow, 1969).

The second evaluative research on the effectiveness of the Police Discretionary Scheme was conducted by Rose and Hamilton in 1964.²³ They allocated randomly all the offenders referred to the Scheme from January 1, 1964 to December 31, 1965 into two groups.²⁴ One group of offenders were cautioned by the police and discharged without any follow up action. As to the other group, the offenders were placed under police supervision. Comparing the reconviction rates of the two groups, they found no evidence that the police supervision could reduce the reconviction rate to a significant degree, either during or after the supervision.

In the above mentioned researches, the effectiveness of the treatment programmes were all measured in terms of reconviction rate. Nevertheless, to use this criterion to assess the effectiveness of the treatment programme was not agreed by all writers. Another commonly used measurement was to observe the offenders' behaviour change and

²³G. Rose and R.A. Hamilton, "Effect of a Juvenile Liaison Scheme", British Journal of Criminology, Vol.10, (1970).

²⁴This was achieved by providing the chief inspector in charge with a series of sealed envelopes in which an instruction for caution or supervision, prepared by throwing dice, had been placed.

social adjustment. This approach seeks to find out whether there is any improvement in the offenders' value towards the societal norms, their adjustment in human relationship, emotional stability, economic status or cultural life etc. Many researches employed this approach while two famous studies are quoted below as examples.

In 1952, a survey to study the outcome of probation treatment was conducted in Essex county by Murphy and Rumney.²⁵ They gathered data on one thousand exprobationers after eleven years and made comparison with their earlier records. The effectiveness of the treatment programme in their study was not only judged by the absence of further offences but also based on some scores obtained for social adjustment. By comparing their present state of social adjustment with their level of adjustment at the time discharged from probation, the research showed that a high percentage of the exprobationers had made a good adjustment and had not been re-arrested.

In a similar study using social adjustment as the criterion to measure effectiveness, the Gluecks obtained a

²⁵ J. Rumney and J.P. Murphy, Probation and Social Adjustment. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1952).

finding differed sharply from the above study. They had studied 906 boys and 309 men who had been placed on probation. Their findings shown that 57.9% and 92.4% of the data collected respectively were failure.²⁶

Apart from using the above mentioned two criteria, another method which is commonly used in assessing the effectiveness of the treatment programme is the application of personality inventory. The researchers adopting this method of measurement attempt to study changes in attitudes, values and other personality variables following treatment. They have made use of the tests such as the Jesness Inventory the California Personality Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Minnesota Personality Scale to measure changes in attitudes supposedly related to delinquency. Nevertheless, there is one major weakness in this method. Though these tests have been shown reliable to discriminate between delinquents and non-delinquents, we are uncertain of whether such change is the result of the treatment programme. It is because personality change can also be a result of many other factors.

²⁶Alexander B. Smith and Alexander Bassin, "Research in a Probation Department," Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 8, No.1, (January 1962,) pp.46-51.

In Hong Kong, the evaluation of the outcomes of the Police Discretionary Scheme employed the reconviction rate as the measuring criterion. Though there is no formal research done on this treatment programmes, the statistics for administrative purpose shows that the programme is very effective in terms of its high success rate. Since the inauguration of the scheme (1963), more than four thousand fresh offenders were placed on the scheme and about 90% of these young offenders had not committed a second offence during their period of police supervision.²⁷ Using similar criterion to assess the outcome of probation treatment, the average success rate during the past decade was about 80%.²⁸ A more sophisticated survey was conducted by the Social Welfare Department in 1973 to explore the situation of the exprobationers one year after they had completed probation.²⁹ From a sample of 789 exprobationers, 170 had committed further offence and this gave a success rate of 78.6%. The survey

²⁷ Hong Kong, The Royal Hong Kong Police Force, Annual Departmental Report of the Commissioner of Police, 1973, (Hong Kong: Government Printer, 1974).

²⁸ Hong Kong, Social Welfare Department, Annual Departmental Report of the Director of Social Welfare, 1972, (Hong Kong: Government Printer, 1973.)

²⁹ Hong Kong, Probation & Corrections Division, Social Welfare Department, A Survey on Exprobationers in Hong Kong. (Mimeographed.)

also explored their social adjustment in terms of their past-time activities, economic activities, adjustment in family and associates etc. However, the survey report presented only facts of data while no further analysis or comparison were made to arrive at a deeper conclusion.

II. THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As shown from the above review of literatures, there are many approaches to assess the effectiveness of a treatment. Thus, the first problem that the present study has to solve is to decide upon what basis the assessment is to make. According to Wilkins, evaluation means the measurement of the degree to which what is attempted is in fact achieved.³⁰ As a result, the way of assessing the programme effectiveness depends very much on how the researcher interprets the desirable outcome of the treatment. For example, if the researcher assumes that the function of the treatment programme is to reduce crime, the best way to assess its effectiveness is to compare the reconviction rate after treatment. On the other hand, if the researcher regards the

³⁰ L.T. Wilkins, "Evaluation of Penal Treatments" in The Sociological Review, Monograph No.9, Sociological Studies in the British Penal Service, ed. by Paul Halmos, (Hanley: F.H. Brookes (Printers) Limited, June 1965,) p.240.

reduction of public expenditure on correctional work as the programme objective, then, its effectiveness will best be assessed by the number of cases that could be granted by the court without increasing the risk to society. In view of this, before the writer reported the way that the present study adopted to measure the comparative effectiveness of the two treatment programmes, it will be necessary to clarify here how the treatment effectiveness is interpreted.

Technically speaking, the reconviction rate is a very objective criterion to assess the effectiveness of treatment programme. Ralph W. England, a researcher in favor of this criterion remarked that, ".... since public officials originally declare an individual guilty of a criminal act, and order him dealt with in way designed to prevent further violation, only the findings of public officials should be used to decide whether or not the intent of the earlier dealings was fulfilled."³¹ However, the prevention of crime is not the only purpose of the two treatment programmes. Apart from this, they also aim to help the young offenders to re-adjust to a socially acceptable way of living. Taking this treatment goal into consideration, the subsequent

³¹ Ralph W. England, Op. cit, p.14.

conviction of the offenders is not sufficient to measure their effectiveness. To borrow Caldwell's criticism, the major weakness of using reconviction rate as the yardstick of measurement is that, 'it is theoretically possible for an offender to fail to complete probation but yet be adjusted. On the other hand, it is conceivable that an offender may be serious maladjusted personally and socially even though he completes the probation period.'³² In view of this, we cannot assess the effectiveness of the two treatment programmes merely by the absence of further offences.

In view of the above mentioned shortcomings, the writer will try to assess the treatment effectiveness from another approach. In the present study, the writer attempts to measure the treatment effectiveness in terms of the social adjustment of the offenders after the termination of the treatment. To support the adoption of this criterion, the writer would like to quote Week's remark that, '..... the treatment they receive, if effective, should alter their attitude, values and opinions and this alteration should be observable at the time they

³²Morris G. Caldwell, Op.cit., p.16.

leave the treatment facilities.³³

III. GENERAL HYPOTHESIS

From the foregoing literatures reviewed, it seems that no conclusive evidence has yet been found to substantiate one treatment programme is superior to the other. So, the null hypothesis on which this study is anchored postulates that:-

"There is no significant difference between the treatment outcome of the juvenile probation service and that of the Police Discretionary Scheme."

IV. DEFINITION OF VARIABLES AND SUB-HYPOTHESES

The definitions of the variables include in the general hypothesis are described as below:-

A. JUVENILE PROBATION

Juvenile in the present study refers to a person

³³H.A. Weeks, "The Highfield Project and Its Success," in The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, ed. by Norman Johnston, et.al., (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.) p.205.

who is between the age of eight and having not attained his/her sixteen birthday.

The word probation derives from Latin, meaning 'a period of proving or trial'. In the correctional field, it is conceptualized as a method of dealing with specially selected offenders, and that it consists of conditional suspension of punishment while the offender is placed under personal supervision and is given individual guidance or treatment.

In operational terms, juvenile probation is a treatment programme for young offenders rest upon the court's power to suspend the sentence of a young offender who is under the age of sixteen so that he is permitted to remain in the community subject to the control of court and under the supervision of probation officer. The period of supervision will be specified in a probation order of no less than one year nor more than three years. The probation treatment is based not only on direct personal influence through office interview, home visits or other forms of guidance, but also depends on the solution of various problems in the life of the probationers such as helping them to secure a decent job, to develop constructive liesure interest

and to cope with the problems of their every day life.

B. POLICE DISCRETIONARY SCHEME

The Police Discretionary Scheme is a treatment programme operated by the police adopting an informal method in dealing with young offenders under the age of sixteen.

In operational terms, the Police Discretionary Scheme is a treatment programme for a young offender who comes within the following circumstances:- (1) he is between the age of eight to sixteen, (2) he admits the offence, (3) the complainant agrees to have no prosecution and (4) his parents or guardian has agreed to have no prosecution and has also agreed that the child to be placed under the police supervision for a period of two years or until the young offender attains his sixteenth birthday. In practice, the Divisional Superintendant of the police will exercise the discretion empowered by attorney general in not prosecuting the juvenile and to place him under the care of police juvenile protection section. Arrangement will then be made for the juvenile to be visited by a police constable at regular intervals to ensure that he does not lapse into crime or associate with undesirable characters.

The method of intervention adopted by the police is based mainly on periodical home visits. These visits will be continued over a period of two years or until the juvenile attains sixteen years of age.

C. THE TREATMENT OUTCOME

In the present study, the treatment outcome refers to the degree of social adjustment of the offenders one year after they have completed the full course of treatment programme.

The conceptual definition of social adjustment is an adaptation to the normal phenomena of a society. It has been suggested that the more an individual understands his society, the better will he functions.³⁴ However, since there are several facets of human life, it will be impossible to explore all aspects of adjustment. Hence, only several dimensions of adjustment which the writer considers most relevant to delinquent behaviour are explored in this study. These dimensions of adjustment include family relationship, social relationship, conformity and emotional stability.

³⁴Scott Nearing, Social Adjustment, (New York: The Macmillian Company, 1911), pp 29-30.

With reference to the above discussion, several sub-hypotheses are further developed for testing:-

H_a : There is no significant difference in the adjustment of family relationships between the clients of the Probation Treatment and the clients of the Police Discretionary Scheme.

H_b : There is no significant difference in the adjustment of social relationships between the clients of the Probation Treatment and the clients of the Police Discretionary Scheme.

H_c : There is no significant difference in the attitudes towards conformity between the clients of the Probation Treatment and the clients of the Police Discretionary Scheme.

H_d : There is no significant difference in the emotional stability between the clients of the Probation Treatment and the clients of the Police Discretionary Scheme.

CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

I. THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

When assessing the effectiveness of a treatment programme, the simplest and the most commonly used method is to make a before and after measurement. However, owing to time limitation and the period of the two treatment programmes are rather long,³⁵ the writer cannot apply this method in the present study. As an alternative, the writer had applied the after-only measurement, namely, to compare the outcomes of the two programmes after the offenders had completed the treatment.

Furthermore, as the present study was to assess the effectiveness of two treatment programmes rather than one single programme, comparison method was used to collect and analyse the data. Samples were drawn from the two treatment programmes in a way that they were as similar

³⁵The length of supervision for the Police Discretionary Scheme varies from a few months to two years. As for the Probation Treatment, the minimum treatment period is one year while the maximum period is three years.

as possible with regard to some major factors that might affect the treatment outcome. In this manner, two equivalent groups of offenders with similar background were exposed to different types of treatment. Then, any significant difference in the treatment outcomes between the two groups would likely be attributable to the effects of the two treatment programmes.

By using the above mentioned method, we can easily find out the comparative effectiveness of the two treatment programmes. However, the major weakness of this design is that it does not provide evidence of the benefit of treatment over no treatment cases. Theoretically speaking, we can remedy this shortcoming by adding a no-treatment group along with the two comparison groups. However, in real practice, it will be very difficult to get a real control group because it is unethical and unfair to leave some clients without service. Nevertheless, trying to provide a standard of social adjustment, the present study has included a third comparison group. This third group is not a pure control group with zero treatment. It is a non-offender group matches in every aspect with the characteristics of the two comparison groups. The reason for introducing this non-offender group is that since the goals of the two treatment programmes are both aiming to bring a normal way of

living back to the offenders, the response of this third comparison group may serve as a standard to mark their degree of adjustment.

II. CONTROL OF INTERVENING VARIABLES

The essence of the aforesaid comparison method is that the groups to be compared should be as nearly as possible to resemble each other in every respect except the independent variable. In the present case, the two offender groups should be identical in character except receiving different types of treatment. If the groups differ in some characters, the difference can be a potential source of treatment outcome. However, this possible drawback can be removed by ensuring through the matching method so that the members of the two groups are selected in a way that they are equivalent with regard to some identified extraneous variables. In the present study, the writer considers that the following variables are possible factors that may affect the treatment results:-

A. AGE

People at different age have different biological

maturation and psychological development. This will undoubtedly affect their behaviour.³⁶ The control of the age difference in the two groups can remove the biasing effect.

B. SEX

Many researchers have shown that behaviour pattern varies significantly between the two sexes. The female are always found less aggressive, less found guilty of breaking the law and always they are related to leniency.³⁷ Thus, in this follow-up study of treatment outcome, this factor is also controlled.

C. EDUCATION

Findings in some delinquency causation studies indicate that the youngsters who deprive of education are more likely to violate the law.³⁸ It may be due to the

³⁶Paul Barker, ed., A Sociological Portrait, (Penguin Books, Ltd., 1972.)

³⁷Finding of the study conducted by University of Cambridge (The Result of Probation) indicates that the success rate for female offender was considerably higher than that of the male offender: 83% as against 64%.

³⁸Agnes Ng, The Social Causes of Violent Crime Among Young Offenders in Hong Kong, (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong - Social Research Center, 1974,) p.141.

lack of knowledge or skill in adopting a decent way of living and they lack also the moral guidance. They are usually more strongly motivated to adventurous endeavours and hence easily drawn in breaking the laws. In order to obtain a group of youngsters who are no more vulnerable than the others, the factor of education is therefore also controlled in this study.

D. THE NATURE OF OFFENCE

Previous studies also indicate that some offences are more easily committed again than the others. For example, Andenaes has pointed out that offences which are typically impulsive, out of emotional stress or mental abnormality, are presumably less likely to be deterred than rationally planned, purposive crime against property.³⁹ Hence, the possibility of failure in the former case is much higher than the latter.

Some other studies indicate that some types of offence are more easy to be detected by the police than the others. In the study of robbery in London, McClintock and

³⁹J. Andenaes, "General Prevention - illusion or reality?" Journal of Criminal law, Criminology & Political Science, Vol 43, (1952), pp. 176-198.

and Gibson found out that the offenders who had committed robberies had the lowest reconviction rate. They pointed out that this figure did not mean that those offenders had a better rehabilitation, they were merely better at escaping detection.⁴⁰

In order to avoid such bias, the nature of offence is also controlled in matching cases in the two comparison groups.

E. PREVIOUS CONVICTION

Offender with previous criminal record will be more difficult to rehabilitate than the fresh offender because the former may be more deep-rooted in deviance. As a result, the factor of previous conviction should also be controlled so as to equalize the degree of deviance in the two comparing groups.

F. THE FAMILY INCOME

The family income may indicate the financial

⁴⁰F.H. McClintock and E. Gibson, Robbery in London, (London: Macmillan, 1961).

situation of the offender's family. Research findings have shown strong evidence that the youngsters from lower income group have a higher delinquent rate because they are more deprived of material and parental guidance.⁴¹ As a result, it is also an important factor that may affect the chance of rehabilitation.

G. PARENTAL INTEGRITY

Another intervening factor that the present study has tried to control is the parental integrity. Many researchers found that the broken family, be it caused by death, desertion, divorce or separation of the parents, had related positively to the occurrence of delinquency. It is because the absence of one natural parent or conflict between parents will affect the amount and quality of parental control and supervision over the children.⁴²

III. THE SAMPLE GROUPS

Owing to time and manpower limitation, it is

⁴¹Martin Davies, Probationer in their Social Environment, (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1969), p.117.

⁴²Ibid., p.41.

impossible for the writer to conduct a large scale study involving all the cases that have undergone the two treatment programmes. In stead, the writer has confined the population of the study to those expired cases in the Hong Kong Island District. The writer chooses Hong Kong Island District as the area of study because its population is rather heterogeneous in character. It has upper class as well as lower class, rural as well as urban people, industrial area as well as residential area, resettlement area as well as villas.

Though the writer has confined the population of the present study to the cases in Hong Kong Island District, yet, there are still so many cases which have undergone the two treatment programmes during the past years. In the present study, the target population only includes those cases which have been completed in between January 1, 1977 and December 31, 1977. The writer wants to compare the outcomes of the two treatment programmes in this particular period of time because many studies have pointed out that reconviction occurs mostly within the first year after leaving the treatment.⁴³ For example, the

⁴³Roger Hood & Richard Sparks, Key Issues in Criminology, (London: World University Library, 1970), pp. 178-179.

the survey conducted by Oatham and Simon on suspended cases and Hand's study on parole give same evidence.

IV. SAMPLING PROCEDURE

As discussed previously, there are many intervening variables such as age, education standard, nature of offence and sex etc. that may affect the treatment outcome. For example, if the comparison groups differ on age distribution, then the age difference may be a possible explanation that attributes to the difference in the treatment outcome. However, if the comparison groups are made equivalent with regard to all the above mentioned extraneous variables, then the only possible explanation for the difference in treatment outcome will most likely be due to the effects of the treatment programmes. In view of the above, the method of matching is used in the present research project to compare and contrast the intervening variables of the comparison groups. The following is a brief description on the procedure of how the three comparison sample groups are obtained.

A. THE POLICE SAMPLE GROUP

The population of the police treatment group is

composed of all the male and female delinquents who were formerly supervision cases of the Police Juvenile Protection Unit in Hong Kong Island District. They had successfully completed the treatment programme during the period of January 1, 1977 to December 31, 1977. Since the records of these offenders were kept by the Juvenile Protection Unit, it was not difficult to obtain a list of these cases with all the necessary information on the intervening variables. Altogether, there were 132 young delinquents in the list. Then, thirty cases were drawn randomly from this pool of expired police supervision cases.⁴⁴ This formed the sample group for the police treatment programme.

B. THE PROBATION SAMPLE GROUP

From the register book of the juvenile probation office in Hong Kong Island District, another list of young delinquents who had completed the probation treatment during January 1, 1977 to December 31, 1977 was also secured. After

⁴⁴Since all the data in the present study has to be collected by the writer alone, the sample size is determined with regard to capability of the writer rather than precise computation. Initially, the writer intends to take 15% of the population as the sample size, namely, about twenty cases. However, taking further consideration into the fact that there will be some non-response cases, the finally decided sample size is thirty cases for each treatment group.

excluding all the cases who had undergone residential treatment.⁴⁵ a number of 121 exprobationers formed the population of the probation treatment programme. Then each case drawn previously for the police sample group was matched with a case in the pool of the probation cases in a way that all the intervening variable discussed previously were found alike. By this method, the probation sample group was obtained with its characteristic made comparable with the police sample group.

Owing to the fact that the selected cases had already completed the treatment a year ago, some offenders had moved away from their previous dwelling places at the time when the study was conducted. Under such circumstances, only twenty pairs of matched cases were successfully approached.

⁴⁵ Sometime, when a juvenile offender is placed on probation treatment, he may also be required to reside in a probation home for a certain period. The writer excludes these cases from the present study because residential treatment is also a significant intervening variable that may lead us to a bias conclusion. This is because one may argue that the difference between the two treatment programmes is a matter of residential versus non-residential treatment rather than the different ways in supervising the offenders.

C. THE NORM GROUP/THE NON-OFFENDER GROUP

The non-offender sample group was designed to provide a standard of social adjustment for the two treatment groups. It was drawn from a secondary school and a primary school. With the help of the teachers, twenty cases were drawn among the pupils with the control variables as selecting criteria. In this way, the characteristic of these twenty cases were matched closely with the two treatment groups in respect of their age, sex, family income and education level.

V. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

in order to ascertain that the characteristics of the three sample groups are identically matched, the distribution of the controlled variables are displayed in the following tables:-

A. AGE

The age distribution of the three comparison groups as presented in the following table suggests that the matching of age is satisfactory. The average age of the three comparison

group are more or less the same. The mean age for the police treatment group is 13.3 years. The mean age for the probation treatment sample and the norm group are both 12.25 years.

TABLE 3.1
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

Age	Police		Probation		Norm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
10	4	20	4	20	4	20
11	0	0	1	5	1	5
12	1	5	1	5	1	5
13	2	10	1	5	1	5
14	7	35	6	30	6	30
15	6	30	7	35	7	35
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100
Mean = 13.3 yrs S.D. = 1.8193		Mean = 12.25 yrs. S.D. = 1.9202		Mean = 12.25 yrs S.D. = 1.9202		

The above statistical break-down also indicates that 65% of the sample in three sample in the three sample groups are above the age of fourteen.

B. SEX

As shown in Table 3.2, there is only a few girls in the three sample groups. (Three in the police treatment group and four in the probation and norm groups.) The writer has failed to get equal number of girls in all comparison groups because there are comparatively less female cases in the two treatment programmes. There are only twenty female cases in the population of the police treatment programme and thirteen cases in the probation treatment programme. Since the writer has to control other variables, the proportion of sex distribution among the three groups is not precisely matched. Nevertheless, since the difference is relatively small, the matching can still be considered as satisfactory.

TABLE 3.2
SEX DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

	Police		Probation		Norm	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Male	17	85	16	80	16	80
Female	3	15	4	20	4	20
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100

C. PARENTAL INTEGRITY

From the statistical break down of the parental integrity of the two treatment groups, the writer found that the majority of the selected respondents were came from favourable family condition. Out of twenty selected cases, only four cases were delinquents with a broken family. As to the norm group, since the information on this variable is not available, this intervening variable has not been matched.

D. FAMILY INCOME

With regard to the family income, more than falf of the respondents's family earn a monthly income of more than\$1500. From the following percentage table, the proportion of the income distribution of the three comparison groups are more or less the same. It may imply that the three groups are satisfactorily matched in this variable.

TABLE 3.3

INCOME OF THE RESPONDENTS' FAMILY

	Family Income	Police		Probation		Norm	
		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Below 1000	A	5	25	6	30	5	25
1001-1500	B	3	25	3	15	3	15
1501-2000	C	8	40	7	35	8	40
2001-2500	D	3	15	3	15	3	15
1501-3000	E	1	5	1	5	1	5
Total		20	100	20	100	20	100

E. EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Regarding the educational level of the respondents, the final result of the matching is presented as follows:-

TABLE 3.4
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENTS

	Police		Probation		Norm	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
P.3 - P.6	10	50	10	50	10	50
F.1 - F.3	10	50	10	50	10	50
Total	20	100	20	100	20	100

Since there are tremendous loss of cases in the matching procedure, the educational level can only be matched by coarser grouping. In the present study, the writer assumes that educational level will only be a significant influential factor between a primary school pupil and a secondary school student and less influential among different classes in primary or secondary level.

F. NATURE OF OFFENCE

Since the population under study is relatively small and the variety of the offences involved are numerous, nature of the offence that the delinquents committed can only be matched by grouping. The following table shows the different types of offences committed by the two sample groups.

TABLE 3.5
OFFENCES COMMITTED BY THE RESPONDENTS

Nature of Offences	Police		Probation	
	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Property offences</u>				
1. Theft	10	50	10	50
2. Burglary	1	5	2	10
3. Handling stolen goods	1	5	0	0
Sub-total	12	60	12	60
<u>Offence of Violation</u>				
1. Robbery	1	5	2	10
2. Criminal Damage	2	10	1	5
Sub-total	3	15	3	15
<u>Miscellaneous</u>				
1. Taking conveyance without authority	1	5	1	5
2. Member of Triad Society	1	5	1	5
3. Wasteful employment of police (e.g. False report)	1	5	1	5
4. Going equipped for stealing	1	5	1	5
5. Blackmail	1	5	0	0
6. Criminal intimidation	0	0	1	5
Sub-total	5	25	5	25
TOTAL	20	100	20	100

VI. THE MEASURING INSTRUMENT

In assessing the outcome of the delinquency treatment programme, measuring instruments have been adopted very variably by different researchers. The problem is that among these measuring instruments, there is a lack of coherence except for the use of the term itself. The researchers develop their own instruments to test their own hypotheses and in many cases, their instruments have been used only once. As a result, validity and reliability of these measuring instruments are not provided. The validity of these instruments are in question because every society has its own specific norms and values. Hence, an measuring instrument which is valid for one society may not be valid when it is applied to another society. Furthermore, since many of these measuring instruments have only used once, it is doubtful whether it will bring similar result in future replication. Hence, in this research project, no standard procedure is followed in constructing the measuring instrument. In stead, before constructing the measuring instrument, some field observation and informal interviews with the workers and clients of the two treatment programmes were taken so as to decide on what criteria should be included. Taking all these information into consideration,

an adjustment scale is then constructed as the measuring instrument for this study.

THE ADJUSTMENT SCALE

The original design of the adjustment scale consisted of fifty questions. Sixteen of these questions concerned with family relationships, ten questions were constructed to assess the social relationships, twelve of them were designed for conformity while the rest of them were constructed to measure emotional stability. The response of each question initially followed a five point Likert-type, namely, the strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, and strongly disagree. The scoring of the responses was designed towards a favourable direction. Therefore, respondents with higher scores would incline to have a healthy social adjustment while the respondents with lower scores might have maladjustment problem.

PRETESTS OF THE ADJUSTMENT SCALE

Before putting this adjustment scale into practice, two small scale pretests had been run to test the suitability of this method of collecting data as well as the adequacy of the scale to measure social adjustment.

The adjustment scale was found on the whole satisfactory although several amendments were made. These pretests served to guarantee that the information were collected without distortion.

The amended adjustment scale consisted of thirty-six questions. Among these thirty-six questions, eleven questions were aiming to test the adjustment in family relationships, six were designed to test social relationships, nine for conformity and the remaining ten related to emotional stability. Another major amendment was that the writer had dropped out the choice of uncertain in the revised social adjustment scale. The reason was that during the pretest, the writer had found that many respondents were reluctant to take side and chose the column of uncertain instead. However, after amendment, the result of the second test showed that the revised form was able to obtain more clear-cut responses.

VII. DATA COLLECTION

The actual data collection was carried out in January, 1979. During the process of data collection, the writer had decided to adopt the method of personal contact.

Though it might be more time consuming, this method ensured a higher response rate. However, due to the change of residence for some selected subjects, the final comparable cases left in the two treatment groups were only twenty in each group.

Even though the writer had successfully located adequate respondents, another problem was to solicit their co-operation. In order to reduce the anxiety and suspicion of the respondents, they were all informed of the writer's interest to interview them and the purpose of the present study by correspondence. (In case of the norm group, the teachers in the school concerned helped the writer in delivering the message.) When the respondents were not at home, follow-up visits were made on the time that they were most likely at home.

In order to increase the degree of reliability of the information collected, a few special procedure were also observed during the process of data collection. Firstly, the writer had tried his best to assure that the interviews were conducted with privacy. Secondly, before the subjects answered any question, the writer would also assure them that their responses would be kept strictly confidential

and would never be seen by their former supervisors. Thirdly, the writer had also pointed out to them all the statements in the questionnaire had no right or wrong answers while what the present research project wanted to find out was how they actually felt.

VIII. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The significant differences among the scorings of the police, probation and the non-offender groups are estimated by means of t-value. Since no prediction is made on which treatment programme is more effective, a two tailed test is used. Furthermore, the writer has arbitrarily considered that the statistically significant differences exist among the three comparison groups when the probability is equal to or less than 0.05.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS: THE ADJUSTMENT IN FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

Negative family relationship has long been recognized as a significant factor conducive to juvenile delinquency. Many delinquency studies evident that juvenile offenders are more likely to have unfavourable relationships with their family members.⁴⁷ Taking this delinquent characteristic into consideration, the degree of satisfactory adjustment in family relationships is used as an indicator to assess the effectiveness of the treatment programme. In the present study, adjustment in family relationships is measured in terms of the following criteria:-

- A. Parents-child Relationship
- B. Siblings' Relationship
- C. Family Conflict
- D. Family Attachment
- E. Family Control
- F. Family Acceptance

⁴⁷ F.I. Nye, Family Relationship and Delinquent Behavior. (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1958.) and see also Agnes Ng, Social Causes of Violent Crime Among Young Offenders in Hong Kong, (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Social Research Center, 1974,) p. 141.

The following sections present the statistical findings of the three sample groups in these areas of adjustment.

A. PARENTS-CHILD RELATIONSHIP

In the adjustment of family relationship, harmonious parents-child relationship is essential. In a study conducted by Healy and Bronner,⁴⁸ the finding indicated that unsatisfactory parents-child relationship was a major factor that attributes to delinquent behavior. They pointed out that if there was a tension or discord among the parents and their children, it would be difficult for the parents to exert proper supervision and control on the latter. Consequently, deviant behaviour easily emerged. Hence, the adjustment in parents-child relationship plays an important role in rehabilitation of a delinquent. In the adjustment scale of the present study, Question No. 25 and No.27 are designed to assess how the respondents feel about their relationships with their parents. The data collected are summarized and presented in the table 4.1 and table 4.2.

⁴⁸ Their conclusion was based on a thorough study of 133 families in which 153 delinquents were examined. William Healy and Augusta Bronner, New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.)

TABLE 4.1
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 25

' My parents always find faults with
me and they do not understand me. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	2	10	7	1
Police	1	7	12	0
Norm Group	1	7	11	1
	4	24	30	2

Statistical Analysis of scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.55	0.605	Pro/Pol t= 0.93	N.S.
Probation	2.35	0.745	Pro/N t=-1.11	N.S.
Norm Group	2.6	0.681	Pol/N t=-0.25	N.S.

The above findings indicate that there is no significant difference among the three comparison groups. However, the mean scores obtained by the probation group is slightly lower.

From table 4.1, scores for the adjustment in parents-child relationship demonstrated by the three groups show no statistically significant difference. However, in table 4.2, more youngsters in the norm group give negative

responses. Although the reason for such is not clear, one of the possibilities is that the delinquents have once been in trouble. (e.g. they have once been arrested by the police for their previous offence) and the assistance from their parents in return gain the trust of their children. On the contrary, the non-offenders have no such experience. Nevertheless, since the difference is not at a significant level, it is considered that the adjustment in parents-child relationship amongst the three comparison groups are more or less the same.

TABLE 4.2

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 27

' I can trust my parents in every thing. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	13	5	1
Police	4	9	7	0
Norm Group	4	5	10	1
	9	27	22	2

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.85	0.745	Pro/Pol	t= 0.6818	N.S.
Probation	2.7	0.657	Pro/N	t= 0.41	N.S.
Norm Group	2.6	0.883	Pol/N	t= 0.97	N.S.

B. SIBLINGS' RELATIONSHIP

Apart from parents-child relationship, siblings' relationship may also be an indicator to show the extent of family adjustment. In every day life, a youngster may sometimes need emotional support from his siblings. However, if there is a sibling rivalry, the youngster will most likely turn to identify with other youngsters outside his family whom are also suffering the same problem. Under such circumstances, he may easily be led astray if he comes to associate with some undesirable characters. In view of this, adjustment of siblings' relationship can be an influential factor that attributes to delinquency. In the present study, Question No.4 and No. 24 in the adjustment scale are designed to explore the siblings' relationship of the respondents. The finding are presented in Table 4.3 and Table 4.4.

TABLE 4.3

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No.4

' When I run into trouble, my siblings won't give me help. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	2	11	7
Police	0	2	15	3
Norm Group	0	3	13	4
	0	7	39	14

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	3.1	0.533	Pro/Pol	t = -1.04	N.S.
Probation	3.3	0.675	Pro/N	t = 1.25	N.S.
Norm Group	3.05	0.605	Pol/N	t = 0.27	N.S.

TABLE 4.4

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 24

'I enjoy having leisure activities with my siblings during holiday.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	10	8	1
Police	3	9	7	1
Norm Group	4	10	6	0
	8	29	21	2

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.7	0.801	Pro/Pol	t = 0.85	N.S.
Probation	2.5	0.688	Pro/N	t = -1.8	N.S.
Norm Group	2.9	0.718	Pol/N	t = -0.83	N.S.

The result of the findings shows that there is also no significant difference in the adjustment of siblings' relationship amongst three comparison groups. However, data in Table 4.4 indicate that more non-offenders enjoy having leisure activities with their siblings. Though the difference is not at a significant level, this may still give some support to the previous assumption that delinquents tend to associate more with youngsters outside their families.

C. FAMILY CONFLICT.

Adjustment in family relationship can also seen from whether one is frequently involved in disputes with one's family members. Presumably, family conflict may lead to disobedience which inhabits the norm learning process. If so, the family is unable to fulfill its regulative functions as an agency of social control. In this light, conflicts between parents and child is also considered to be an influential factor in the causation of juvenile delinquency.⁴⁹ In the present study, Question No. 2 and No.33 are designed to explore this area of adjustment. The data of these two questions are presented in the following tables:-

⁴⁹R.M. Foster, "Interpsychi and Environmental factors in Running Away from Home," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol.32,pp. 436-491.

TABLE 4.5

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 2

' I am often involved in family disputes. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	4	14	2
Police	0	7	9	4
Norm Group	0	3	17	0
	0	14	40	6

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.8	0.696	Pro/Pol	t = -0.22	N.S.
Probation	2.9	0.553	Pro/N	t = 0.34	N.S.
Norm Group	2.85	0.366	Pol/N	t = -0.2777	N.S.

TABLE 4.6

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 33

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	4	5	11	0
Police	1	13	6	0
Norm Group	2	11	6	1
	7	29	23	1

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.65	0.489	Pro/Pol	t = 0	N.S.
Probation	2.65	0.813	Pro/N	t = -0.2	N.S.
Norm Group	2.7	0.733	Pol/N	t = -0.25	N.S.

Though no statistical significant can be found in comparing the mean scores obtained for question No.33. frequency distribution of choices indicates that more respondents in the probation group are willing to solve family problem through discussion.

The statistical findings as shown in Table 4.5 and Table 4.6 indicate that there is no significant difference in the area of family conflict amongst police, probation and the non-offender group. However, judging from the frequency distribution of their choices in Table 4.5, the non-offender group tends to have less conflict with their family members.

D. FAMILY ATTACHMENT

Another major area of family adjustment is the emotional attachment of children. Family attachment is believed to be negatively associated with delinquency. Presumably, delinquents are less attached to their family because they enjoy the unbridled way of life. On the contrary, non-delinquents are more closely attached to their family and have a stronger sense of family responsibility. In the present study, question No. 7 and No.10 are designed to measure this characteristic. The findings of these two

questions are presented in Table 4.7 and Table 4.8.

TABLE 4.7
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 7

'I think I should spend all the money that I have earned myself.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	3	12	5
Police	0	9	10	1
Norm Group	0	2	12	6
	0	14	34	12

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.6	0.598	Pro/Pol	t = -2.55	0.015
Probation	3.1	0.641	Pro/N	t = -0.5	N.S.
Norm Group	3.2	0.616	Pol/N	t = -3.13	0.003

Data in Table 4.7 shows that there are significant difference between the scores obtained by police sample group and that of the norm group and the probation sample group. The respondents of the probation group and norm group have shown that they are more willing to shoulder up family responsibility. Such is shown in their willingness to share their income with their family members. In contrast, the respondents of the police sample group indicate that they are less willing to render financial support to their families.

TABLE 4.8

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 10

' My home is a very harmonious place. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	2	16	2	0
Police	2	15	2	1
Norm Group	4	16	0	0
	8	47	4	1

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.9	0.641	Pro/Pol t = -0.57	N.S.
Probation	3.0	0.459	Pro/N t = -1.45	N.S.
Norm Group	3.2	0.410	Pol/N t = -1.7674	N.S.

In Table 4.8, the data show that there is also no significant difference among the three sample groups in their attachment to family. Nevertheless, all the respondents in the non-offender group show positive responses towards their families, while a few cases in the the two treatment groups indicate negative feeling.

E. FAMILY CONTROL

The reaction and feeling of the respondents towards parental control may also reflect their family adjustment. It is assumed that social norms are obeyed only after they have

been effectively learnt. The family, on the other hand, is a major agency in teaching these norms. Therefore, if a juvenile is capable to adjust to parental control and responses positively, it may imply that he is also able to adjust to normative behaviour in the society. On the contrary, deviant behaviour is expected to be higher if youngsters are out of family control.⁵⁰ In this study, Question No. 13 and No. 18 are constructed to find out the respondents' adjustment toward family control.

TABLE 4.9

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No 13

'When my parents are strict with me, I understand they do it for my own good.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	4	12	3	1
Police	2	15	3	0
Norm Group	6	12	2	0
	12	39	8	1

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.95	0.51	Pro/Pol	t = -0.27	N.S.
Probation	3.0	0.649	Pro/N	t = -1.00	N.S.
Norm Group	3.2	0.616	Pol/N	t = -1.40	N.S.

⁵⁰A Bandura and R.H. Walters, Adolescent Aggression, (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1959).

In Table 4.9, data revealed that there is no significant difference among the three groups in their reactions towards family control though the responses of the norm group are again slightly better.

TABLE 4.10
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 18

' I can stand on my own feet and thus need no parental guidance.

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	5	12	2
Police	1	6	11	2
Norm Group	0	4	9	7
	2	15	32	11

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.65	0.745	Pro/Pol t = -0.43	N.S.
Probation	2.75	0.716	Pro/N t = -1.739	N.S.
Norm Group	3.15	0.745	Pol/N t = -2.12	0.04

As shown in Table 4.10, the police sample group obtains a comparatively lower score in question No. 18. This may imply that more respondents in this sample group find family control unnecessary. Family control exercise in this cases may provoke fear or hatred and the youngsters will in fact show no real respect towards the family authority. Some similar responses are also observed in the probation

group, yet, the total scores obtained shows no difference when it is compared with the other two groups. However, there is significant difference between the mean scores obtained by the police and the norm group. Hence, the probation group respondents are slightly more adjusted than the police respondents, but, they are less adjusted when compared with the norm group.

F. FAMILY ACCEPTANCE

Another way of assessing family adjustment can be done by exploring the extent to which the family members have accepted the youngster. It is postulated that if one is well adjusted in family relationship, his ideas and suggestions will be respected by his family members. On the contrary, a youngster with maladjusted family relationship will have no say in the family affairs. In the present study, Question No. 5 is designed to assess this area of adjustment.

TABLE 4.11
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 5

' My family members usually accept my suggestions. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	11	7	1
Police	2	12	6	0
Norm Group	0	7	11	2
	3	30	24	3

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.8	0.616	Pro/Pol	t = 0.53	N.S.
Probation	2.7	0.517	Pro/N	t = 2.35	0.024
Norm Group	2.25	0.639	Pol/N	t = 2.77	0.009

The finding of the data indicates that there is no significant difference in the extent of family acceptance between police and probation treatment group. However, the responses differ significantly when their scores are compared with the norm group. The writer finds out that the majority of the subjects in the non-offender group expressed that their suggestions are usually not accepted by their family members. This appears contradictory to the previous findings on family adjustment. Nevertheless, one possible answer to this is that the non-offenders may be more passive in character and thus they are more ready to accept the ideas

of their family members instead of insisting on their own suggestions.

SUMMARY

From the analysis of the above discussed areas of family adjustment, only little difference can be sorted out from the responses obtained. Hence, broadly speaking, there is no significant difference in the overall adjustment of family relationship among the three sample groups. This point can further be exemplified by adding up the scores obtained for the above mentioned areas. The overall picture of the adjustment in family life can be presented as follow:-

TABLE 4.12

SCORES FOR THE FAMILY ADJUSTMENT SCALE OF THE THREE SAMPLES

	Mean and Standard Deviation			Significance*		
	Police (n=20)	Probation (n=20)	Norm (n=20)	Police VS Probation	Probation VS Norm	Police VS Norm
X	30.5	30.9	31.7	t=-0.31	t=-0.87	t=-1
S.D.	(4.478)	(3.523)	(2.155)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

* All t-test of group means differences are two tailed. Differences not significant at 0.05 level or better are indicated as N.S.

On examining the results of the statistical analysis of the above table, we conclude that there is no significant difference in the three sample groups. Family adjustment of the clients in the probation treatment programme and that of police treatment programme are more or less the same. Therefore, the first sub-hypothesis (H_a) is accepted.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS: THE ADJUSTMENT IN SOCIAL RELATIONSHIP

Human relationships are often the main focus of attention of the social workers. The reason is that the way how one behaves is largely determined by the adaptation to these relationships. Babies in a nursery usually play individually, taking little notice of others. However, when they grow older and learn to play together, they have to observe the rules of the game. In other words, the adjustment in social relationships is in fact a process of learning role expectations. The more fully these relationships are understood and adjusted, the better will the individual functions in the society. According to the research conducted by Grant and Grant at Camp Elliott,⁵¹ youngsters who are maladjustment in personal relationships are much more likely to become involve in delinquency than well adjusted ones. In this light, the adjustment in social relationships can be used as a criterion to assess whether one has achieved an orderly social life. In the present

⁵¹ J.D. Grant and M.Q. Grant, "A Group Dynamics Approach to the Treatment of Non-conformists in the Navy." *Annals of the American Acad. of Political and Social Science*, (32, 1956,) p.126.

study, two special areas of adjustment in social relationship are measured. They are:-

A. Sociability

B. Social Participation

A. SOCIABILITY

Human beings are social animals. In daily life, an individual continually meets people and co-operates with them. He acts in the awareness of the others and adjusts to their responses. In this way, social interactions are in fact an instrument of control, because they limit action and restrain impulses that may threaten social order. If any one fails to adjust in social interactions, it may imply that there is only weak social control on him. In Ivy Bennett's study, many delinquents were found to have difficulties in interacting with others. They had no friend, unsociable or simply did not get along with others.⁵² On the other hand, Sullivan, Grant and Grant also classified the delinquents who were able to adjust in social relationship as the one who had internalized a set of standards by

⁵²Ivy Bennett, Delinquent and Neurotic Children - a comparative study, (London: Tavistock Publication Limited, 1960,) p.492.

which they judged their own and other's behaviour. They were also aware of the expectations of others and the effects of their own behaviour on others.⁵³ With reference to the above, Question No. 11 and No. 32 are designed in the present to explore this area of adjustment.

TABLE 5.1

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No.11

'If I am in trouble, I seek assistance from a friend.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	2	12	6	0
Police	1	15	4	0
Norm Group	3	14	3	0
	6	41	13	0

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	MEAN	S.D.	t VALUE	P.
Police	2.85	0.489	Pro/Pol t = 0	N.S.
Probation	2.85	0.587	Pro/N t = -0.8333	N.S.
Norm Group	3.00	0.562	Pol/N t = -0.9	N.S.

Data in the above table indicate that there is no significant difference in the scores obtained by the

⁵³C.E. Sullivan, et. al., "The Development of interpersonal maturity : applications to delinquency," Psychiatry, (vol.20, 1957,) p.373.

three sample groups. Nevertheless, slightly more subjects in the norm group are ready to seek help from his peers if he runs into trouble. In other words, they are more ready to receive advice from others.

TABLE 5.2

' When other people are arround, I usually feel very nervous.'
Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	3	15	1
Police	0	3	16	1
Norm Group	1	3	12	4
	2	9	42	6

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.9	0.447	Pro/Pol	t = 0.5882	N.S.
Probation	2.8	0.616	Pro/N	t = -0.69	N.S.
Norm Group	2.95	0.759	Pol/N	t = -0.25	N.S.

As shown in the above table, distribution of choices amongst the three groups are more or less the same. However, subjects in the norm groups show stronger reactions.

TABLE 5.3

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No.32

'I. like getting along with my neighbours.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	4	9	7	0
Police	1	13	6	0
Norm Group	2	10	7	1
	7	32	20	1

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.8	0.616	Pro/Pol t = 0	N.S.
Probation	2.8	0.696	Pro/N t = 0.66	N.S.
Norm Group	2.65	0.745	Pol/N t = 0.69	N.S.

Data of the above table indicate that there is also no significant difference among the three sample groups in their relationship with neighbours.

B. SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Apart from sociability, another major area of adjustment in social relationship is the extent of one's social participation. Some literatures in delinquency have pointed out that non-delinquents are more ready to assume responsibility in group efforts and usually adopt

an co-operative attitude towards others.⁵⁴ In a study conducted by Bennett, delinquents are found 'markedly retarded in school and below average in general interests and attainment.'⁵⁵ In view of the above, non-delinquents are presumable more enjoy group life and are more willing to co-operate with others. In the present study, Question NO. 16 No.30 and No.34 are constructed to explore this area of adjustment. Their findings are presented as follow:-

TABLE 5.4

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 16

'It is more enjoyable to see a picture together with a friend than alone. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	4	8	6	2
Police	5	9	3	3
Norm Group	10	2	3	5
	19	19	12	10

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.75	0.851	Pro/Pol	t = 0.18	N.S.
Probation	2.7	0.923	Pro/N	t = -0.42	N.S.
Norm Group	2.85	1.309	Pol/N	t = -0.29	N.S.

⁵⁴J.J. Conger and W.G. Miller, Personality, Social Class and Delinquency, (New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc. 1966,) p.137.

⁵⁵Ivy Bennett, Op.cit., p.216.

Data of the Table 4.16 show that the responses obtained from the subjects of the three comparison groups resemble to one another. Though there is no significant difference in the mean scores, it is found that the subjects of the norm group tend to make more strong and definite answers than the subjects in the other two treatment groups.

TABLE 5.5
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 30

' In group activity, I prefer to sit alone. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	6	10	3
Police	0	4	15	1
Norm Group	1	1	12	6
	2	11	37	10

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.9	0.553	Pro/Pol	t = 0.7	N.S.
Probation	2.75	0.786	Pro/N	t = -1.65	N.S.
Norm Group	3.15	0.745	Pol/N	t = -1.21	N.S.

No significant difference is found from the mean scores obtained by the three comparison groups. However, from the frequency distribution of choices, the subjects in the norm group give more positive answers than

the two other treatment groups. Anyway, such difference is not statistically significant.

TABLE 5.6

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No.34

' I prefer to work all by myself
than to work together with other. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	2	10	8	0
Police	1	8	11	0
Norm Group	3	8	5	4
	6	26	24	4

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.5	0.607	Pro/Pol t = 1	N.S.
Probation	2.3	0.657	pro/N t = -0.73	N.S.
Norm Group	2.5	1	Pol/N t = 0	N.S.

From the above analysis, no statistical significant difference is found among the scores obtained from the respondents in the three comparison groups.

SUMMARY

The second sub-hypothesis of this study is that there is no significant difference in the adjustment of

social relationship between the clients of the Probation Treatment Programme and the clients of the Police Discretionary Scheme. The data in the previous tables show that there is no significant difference in the responses among the three sample groups towards the two areas investigated. Though the subjects in the non-offender group have comparatively obtained a higher score, the difference is not statistically significant. From the accumulation of scores obtained in the measures of social relationship, hypothesis (H_b) is upheld. This result may suggest that the offenders are able to maintain a satisfactory interpersonal relationship with friends and relatives in the society even one year after the completion of the treatment programme. The scores obtained in the three sample groups are summed up in the following table.

TABLE 5.7

SCORES FOR THE ADJUSTMENT SCALE FOR SOCIAL RELATIONSHIP

	Mean and Standard Deviation			Significance*		
	Police (n=20)	Probation (n=20)	Norm (n=20)	Police vs Probation	Probation vs Norm	Police vs Norm
X	16.7	16.2	17.1	t=0.81	t=-1.3	t=-0.67
S.D.	(1.539)	(2.238)	(2.15)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

* All t-test of group means differences are two tailed. Differences not significant at 0.05 level or better are indicated as N.S.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS: CONFORMITY

Delinquent behaviour can be explained in broad terms as the behaviour that acts differently from the societal norms. In Merton's terms, deviant behaviour refers to "conduct that departs significantly from norm set for people in their statuses..... Deviant behaviour cannot be described in the abstract but must be related to the norms that are socially defined as appropriate and morally binding for people occupying various statuses."⁵⁶ As a result, what the correctional treatment programme tries to help is to bring them back to the right path from deviation. In this light, conformity becomes a good indicator to measure the effectiveness of the treatment programme. In the present adjustment scale, the writer refers conformity to the behaviour variables which are acceptable to the society. On the contrary, non-conformity is comprised of the followings:-

⁵⁶R.K. Merton, "Social Problem and Sociological Theory," in R.K. Merton and R.A. Nisbet, ed. Contemporary Social Problem, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961,) pp. 723-724.

- A. Anti-Non institutionalized Norm,
- B. Conforming to Parental Guidance,
- C. Rebellious,
- D. Immediate Gratification,
- E. Anti-authority, and
- F. Anti-regulation.

The responses of the sample groups towards the above mentioned areas of conformity are collected and presented below:-

A. ANTI -NON INSTITUTIONALIZED NORM

There are various types of norms in the society and they are classified according to the strength of sanctions associates with them. Norms that are perceived more important than other become institutionalized as laws. On the contrary,violating norms that are only traditonal customs (e.g. like the way of dressing) will bring no sanction. However, the conformity to non-institutionalized can also indicate whether one is behaving in a socially acceptable manner. In the present study, Question No.8 is designed to measure this aspect of conformity.

TABLE 6.1
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 8

' I dress up for a party even when I hate to do so. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	5	14	0	1
Police	6	12	2	0
Norm Group	10	8	0	2
	21	34	2	3

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t</u>	<u>VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	3.15	0.587	Pro/Pol	t = 0.2631	N.S.
Probation	3.10	0.641	Pro/N	t = -0.8	N.S.
Norm Group	3.30	0.923	Pol/N	t = -0.61	N.S.

Table 4.20 shows that there is no statistical significant difference between the mean scores of three sample groups obtained for Question No.8. However, subjects in the norm group tend to have more positive responses because they give more definite answers.

B. CONFORMING TO PARENTAL GUIDANCE

Since family has the most intimate contact with a child during his formative years, it has long been regarded as the most important agent that trains a child as law abiding citizen. If the family fails to acquaint him with

the rules of the society, he will easily become a delinquent. In other words, whether a child conforms to his parents' advice will significantly affect his chance of becoming delinquent. In the present study, Question No.31 is constructed to test this aspect of conformity.

TABLE 6.2
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 31

' When my parents nag, I find their nagging helpful. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	6	8	5	1
Police	5	8	7	0
Norm Group	3	14	3	0
	14	30	15	1

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.85	0.745	Pro/Pol	t = -0.84	N.S.
Probation	3.05	0.759	Pro/N	t = 0.24	N.S.
Norm Group	3	0.562	Pol/N	t = -0.72	N.S.

As shown from the frequency distribution of choices presented in Table 6.2, majority of the respondents in all three sample groups are conformed with their parents' guidance. Though there is no significant difference in the mean scores obtained by each comparison group, there are slightly more

subjects in the norm group found themselves conform with their parents' guidance than the two treatment groups.

C. REBELLIOUS

If a youngster fails to adjust himself to social norms, a great deal of resentment and hostility will arise in him. Generally speaking, if these resentment and hostility continue, they may constitute a basis for delinquency. In committing delinquent act, one may not only rebels against the law, but also act unconsciously against all conventional pattern of behaviour. According to David Abrahamsen, the overtly rebellious youngster exhibits a general attitude of defiance and undue aggressiveness and such a pattern is quite frequently found in the reactions of juvenile offenders.⁵⁷ In the present study, Question No. 3 is included to explore this delinquent characteristic.

⁵⁷D. Abrahamsen, The Psychology of Crime, (Columbia University Press, 1960,) p.75.

TABLE 6.3

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 3

' When I am moody, I like to start a fight
with other people to get me over my depression.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	4	9	7
Police	0	1	11	8
Norm Group	0	0	10	10
	0	5	30	25

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	3.35	0.587	Pro/Pol	t = 0.94	N.S.
Probation	3.15	0.745	Pro/N	t = -1.73	N.S.
Norm Group	3.50	0.513	Pol/N	t = -0.86	N.S.

The above collected data shows that the majority of subjects in all three sample groups are not rebellious in character. They are able to observe the conventional pattern of behaviour and show no aggression when they have emotion problems. Further examination of the frequency distribution of choices indicates that subjects in the norm group are slightly more conform to conventional behaviour than the other two treatment groups, though the difference is again not at a statistical significant level.

Apart from the failure of adjusting to conventional norms, the desire for individuality is another source of rebellious. The pressure to conform to conventional behaviour tends to reduce individuality. However, to fight for individuality is a personality characteristic commonly found in the stage of adolescent. Hence, youngsters are frequently found to behave or act differently from others. This can be healthy if such is kept within certain limits, but if such rebelliousness becomes part of the youngster's character, then criminal activities may easily occur. In the present study, Question No. 35 is designed to test this delinquent character. Though the validity of this question to test the aforesaid delinquent character is to some extent doubtful, the writer includes this question in the adjustment scale because he hopes to find out whether the subjects in the three sample groups will respond differently to it.

TABLE 6.4

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 35

' I Like doing things different from other. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	2	10	6	2
Police	1	9	10	0
Norm	2	8	8	2
	5	27	24	4

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.45	0.605	Pro/Pol	t = 0.22	N.S.
Probation	2.4	0.821	Pro/N	t = -0.38	N.S.
Norm Group	2.5	0.827	Pol/N	t = -0.22	N.S.

The above table shows that there is no significant different among the scores and distribution of choices in the three comparison groups. It is also interesting to note that the proportion of positive and negative answer in the Police and Norm Group are more or less the same. The only except is that in the Probation sample group, more respondents wish to do thing different form others.

D. IMMEDIATE GRATIFICATION

Many readings in juvenile delinquency show that

impulsive actions are by no means uncommon in youngsters.⁵⁸ They are less self controlled and have a stronger desire to gratify their need immediately. Not all the delinquent's desires are socially unacceptable. Some desires become unacceptable only by their urgency, leading the child to satisfy them at the wrong time and in the wrong place. Sometime, the desire may be too strong that they will gratify their need through illegal means. In other word, the drive of immediate gratification may lead to deviant behaviours. On the contrary, one who is able to conform to social norm will be able to observe social order and suppress one's desire for immediate gratification. Question No.21 in the present study is designed to assess this area of adjustment.

⁵⁸Cyril Burt has taken important notice of this in his writing 'The Young Delinquent' (London: University of London Press Ltd., 1952) while some discussion of this has also been given in Kate Friedlander's 'The Psycho-analytical Approach to Juvenile Delinquent.' (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1947.)

TABLE 6.5

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No.21

'I line up, and wait at a bus stop even if I am in a hurry.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	2	11	6	1
Police	0	13	6	1
Norm Group	8	9	3	0
	10	33	15	2

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.6	0.589	Pro/Pol t = -0.47	N.S.
Probation	2.7	0.733	Pro/N t = -2.4	0.021
Norm Group	3.25	0.716	Pol/N t = -3.11	0.004

From the above data, we can identify some significant differences among the three sample groups. Firstly, the responses of the norm group towards immediate gratification is significantly different from that of the two treatment groups. Their responses indicate that they are less impulsive and are able to suppress their needs for immediate gratification. On the contrary, both subjects of the police and probation sample groups show a stronger desire for immediate gratification. This may imply that the subjects of police and probation sample groups are more likely to violate law and order than the norm group. Hence,

in terms of helping the offenders to apply self-control or to with-hold the desire for immediate gratification, the result of both treatment programmes are not satisfactory. Furthermore, the research data also indicate there is no significant difference in the scores between the two treatment groups. This may imply that their treatment effect are more or less the same.

E. ANTI-REGULATION

It is postulated that on the basis of the principle of generalization, one who fails to conform to social values will more likely neglect the regulations set in the society. They will act according to their own pleasure rather than observing law and order. Question No. 28 and No. 36 is designed to assess the respondents' adjustment to rules and regulations.

TABLE 6.6
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 28

'In a public part, I will pick the flowers unattended by the gardener.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	4	12	4
Police	0	3	13	4
Norm Group	0	1	7	12
	0	8	32	20

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	3.1	0.641	Pro/Pol t = 0.25	N.S.
Probation	3.05	0.605	Pro/N t = -2.61	0.013
Norm Group	3.55	0.605	Pol/N t = -2.28	0.028

The data collected in Table 6.6 provides evidence that the subjects of the norm group are significantly more adjusted to regulations than the police and the probation group. Again, there is no significant difference between the probation and the police sample group in this aspect. In other words, this implies that both police and probation treatment programmes are not very effective in helping their clients to observe regulations.

TABLE 6.7
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 36

' If there is no doorkeeper at the entrance,
I can just walk in the theater and see
the picture without buying a ticket. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	6	9	5
Police	0	1	11	8
Norm Group	1	0	9	10
	1	7	29	23

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	3.35	0.587	Pro/Pol	t = 1.86	N.S.
Probation	2.95	0.759	Pro/N	t = -1.88	N.S.
Norm Group	3.40	0.754	Pol/N	t = -0.23	N.S.

Though no statistical significant difference is found in the mean scores obtained by the three sample groups in Question No. 36, the frequency distribution of choices shows that more subjects in the norm group tend to conform with law and order.

F. ANTI-AUTHORITY

In committing anti-regulation behaviour, a delinquent will not only rebell against the relationships

but may also unconsciously rebel against authority figures who are enforcing regulations. Such character will easily be found in the attitude on offenders. For example, delinquents usually dislike police and are reluctant to offer them co-operation. Question No. 14 and No. 23 are designed to test the respondents' attitudes toward authority.

TABLE 6.8

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 14

'When the polices are chasing after a thief,
I would like to see the thief escape.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	3	11	6
Police	1	2	12	5
Norm Group	0	1	7	12
	1	6	30	23

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	3.1	0.641	Pro/Pol	t = -0.24	N.S.
Probation	3.15	0.671	Pro/N	t = -1.98	N.S.
Norm Group	3.55	0.605	Pol/N	t = -2.28	0.028

In view of the data shown in Table 6.8, there is a significant difference in the attitudes toward authority between the norm group and the police sample group. Subjects of the police sample group have a more negative feeling

towards authority. On the contrary, such is not found on the subjects of norm group. The attitude of the probation sample group is somewhere in between the above two. As a result, no significant difference is found when the responses of probation group is compared with the other two groups. However, it may indicate that the adjustment of subjects in probation group towards authority is slightly better than the subjects in police treatment group, though it is not at a significant level.

TABLE 6.9

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 23

' If my neighbour is robbed, I'll ring up the police immediately.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	5	12	2	1
Police	3	14	3	0
Norm Group	6	9	5	0
	14	35	10	1

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	3	0.562	Pro/Pol	t = -0.238	N.S.
Probation	3.05	0.759	Pro/N	t = 0	N.S.
Norm Group	3.05	0.759	Pol/N	t = -0.238	N.S.

From the responses gathered for Question No. 23, no significant difference is found amongst the three

comparison groups. However, from the frequency distribution of choices, the writer is quite surprised to find out that there are more respondents in the two treatment groups who are willing to co-operate with the police than the subjects in the norm group.

SUMMARY

The third sub-hypothesis of this study is that there is no significant difference in their attitudes towards conformity between the clients of probation treatment programme and the clients of the Police Discretionary Scheme. By adding up all the scores obtained for the variables concerning conformity, we found that there is significant difference between the norm group and the two treatment groups.

TABLE 6.10

SCORES FOR THE ADJUSTMENT SCALE FOR CONFORMITY

	Mean and Standard Deviation			Significance*		
	Police (n=20)	Probation (n=20)	Norm (n=20)	Police VS Probation	Probation VS Norm	Police VS Norm
\bar{X}	26.95	26.65	29.2	t=0.3061	t=-2.96	t=-2.63
S.D.	(2.873)	(3.376)	(2.567)	N.S.	0.011	0.012

* All t-test of group means differences are two tailed. Differences not significant at 0.05 level or better are indicated as N.S.

Findings in the above table implies that the delinquent traits are not yet totally removed from the subjects of the two treatment groups. As no significant difference is found between the police and probation sample, it may lead to a conclusion that the effectiveness of the two treatment programmes are more or less the same. In addition, their treatment outcomes have not reached the desirable standard. The findings fail to reject the third sub-hypothesis (H_c).

CHAPTER VII

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS: EMOTIONAL STABILITY

The degree of emotional stability is positively related to delinquent behaviour. As Abrahamsen points out, the main characteristic of juvenile delinquent is that he acts out his inner conflicts. " When a person who feels emotionally weak and insecure, he may develop a defensive or aggressive attitude as a cover up. "⁵⁹ This is one way which a person may be led to delinquent behaviour. In addition, Abrahamsen also finds out that the delinquents are unable to withstand pain and discomfort or to postpone immediate gratification of his desire. Hence, any pressure from the environment may make them feel anxious. Since anxiety has to be discharged in one way or another, one will gain relief by acting out his impulses in form of deviant behaviour. Along with this line of thinking, the state of the respondent's emotional stability is used as a criterion to measure the comparativeness of the treatment programmes. The variables used to indicate the state of emotional stability include:-

⁵⁹D. Abrahamsen, Op. cit., p.33.

- A. Emotional Deprivation,
- B. Depression,
- C. Mood Fluctuation,
- D. Aggression,
- E. Anxiety

The findings related to the above variables are presented in the following paragraphs:-

A. EMOTIONAL DEPRIVATION

The lack of love and affection that bring about emotional deprivation plays an important part in a person's life and it is an essential factor in producing deviant behaviour. Frances Smart has pointed out that aggressive behaviour may be strongly activated if a child is deprived of love and affection, especially when he is rejected during the earliest years of his life.⁶⁰ With reference to the above, Question No. 15 is formulated under the assumption that emotional unstabled youngsters are more likely to be deprived of love and affection.

⁶⁰Frances Smart, Neurosis and Crime, (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co. Ltd., 1970,) p.93

TABLE 7.1

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 15

' No one seems to understand me. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	7	10	2
Police	0	6	12	2
Norm Group	1	6	12	1
	2	19	34	5

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.8	0.616	Pro/Pol t = 0.92	N.S.
Probation	2.6	0.754	Pro/N t = -0.22	N.S.
Norm Group	2.65	0.671	Pol/N t = 0.74	N.S.

Data presented in the above table shows that the scores obtained by the subjects in the three sample groups are very much alike. No significant difference is identified.

Question No 17 and No. 19 pose another situation. The writer assumes that emotionally unstable person is more likely to be rejected child in a family. The feeling of being rejected may create anger and resentment towards his family members. However, on the other hand, he is also eager to win their acceptance. As a result of the struggle of resentment and desire of acceptance, deviant behaviour

may occur. (For example, some delinquents violate law just because of seeking his family's attention.) Question No. 17 is designed to explore whether the respondents have such feelings.

TABLE 7.2
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 17

'It seems that I am the most unwanted child in my family.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	2	16	2
Police	0	4	14	2
Norm Group	0	3	14	3
	0	9	44	7

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.9	0.553	Pro/Pol	t = -0.99	N.S.
Probation	3.05	0.394	Pro/N	t = -0.3333	N.S.
Norm Group	3	0.562	Pol/N	t = -0.57	N.S.

The above findings indicate that there is no significant difference in the responses obtained from the three sample groups. Furthermore, data also indicate that the majority of respondents are well accepted by their families.

Apart from the situation described above, emotionally unstable person often has little self-confidence. Sometimes,

he may be over sensitive and over worry of family acceptance. Question No. 29 is formulated under this assumption.

TABLE 7.3

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 29

' My parents say and do things that make me feel that I am not trusted. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	5	13	1
Police	1	5	12	2
Norm Group	0	4	11	5
	2	14	36	8

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.65	0.671	Pro/Pol t = -0.24	N.S.
Probation	2.7	0.657	Pro/N t = -1.65	N.S.
Norm Group	3.05	0.686	Pol/N t = -1.86	N.S.

No significant difference can be found among the responses gathered from the three sample groups. Nevertheless, there is a tendency that the subjects of the norm group present more positive responses.

B. DEPRESSION

Depression can be developed from a number of reasons. It may be the result of failure, disappointment

or death of a beloved one. Sometimes, the reason for depression may not even be known or obvious to the person concerned. Anyhow, as long as the person is depressed, he is emotionally unstable at that time. If a person feels that everything is alright and satisfactory, he is not likely to become depressed. In other words, he is also enjoying a socially acceptable way of living. Question No. 22 is based on this assumption.

TABLE 7.4
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No.22

' My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	2	10	8	0
Police	0	16	4	0
Norm Group	4	11	5	0
	6	37	17	0

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.8	0.41	Pro/Pol	t = 0.5882	N.S.
Probation	2.7	0.657	Pro/N	t = -1.18	N.S.
Norm Group	2.95	0.686	Pol/N	t = -0.84	N.S.

Result of data analysis shows no significant difference amongst the mean scores of the three comparison

groups. Again, the respondents in the norm group obtain higher score while the scores obtained from the probation group turns out to be the lowest. This may imply that more respondents in the probation group find life not as meaningful as the other respondents perceived.

To put the above in another way, we may say that when a person is maladjusted, life to him will look meaningless and hopeless. This maladjustment will be shown in great depression. It is under this assumption Question No. 9 is formulated.

TABLE 7.5

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 9

' Most of the time I feel blue. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	3	14	3
Police	1	2	13	4
Norm Group	0	1	14	5
	1	6	41	12

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	3	0.725	Pro/Pol t = 0	N.S.
Probation	3	0.562	Pro/N t = -1.16	N.S.
Norm Group	3.2	0.523	Pol/N t = -1	N.S.

The frequency Distribution of choices shows that only one subject in the norm group expresses the feeling of depression, while there are three subjects in both police and probation treatment who give this feeling. Nevertheless, this difference is again not at a statistically significant level.

C. MOOD FLUCTUATION

Generally speaking, loss of interest, being moody or wish to escape form reality are common characteristics found in an emotionally unstable person.⁶¹ Basing on this characteristic, Question No. 20 is constructed on the assumption that if one is maladjusted at home, he has a strong intention to leave home when he becomes moody.

⁶¹H.J. Eysenck and S.B.G. Eysenck, Personality Structure and Measurement, (London: Rontledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1969), pp. 156-163.

TABLE 7.6
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No.20

' At times, I have very much wanted to leave home. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	5	11	4
Police	0	5	12	3
Norm	0	1	9	10
	0	11	32	17

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.9	0.641	Pro/Pol	t = -0.93	N.S.
Probation	3.1	0.718	Pro/N	t = -1.67	N.S.
Norm	3.45	0.605	Pol/N	t = -2.79	0.008

Significant difference is found when comparing the scores obtained by the norm group with the scores of the two treatment groups. The finding shows that the subjects in the norm group are more emotionally stable while the subjects in the two treatment groups have a higher tendency to become moody. However, no significant difference can be found when comparing the scores between the police and the probation group. This may imply that their states of mood fluctuation are more or less the same.

Question No. 26 present another example to describe

the state when a person becomes moody. The writer postulates that an emotionally stable is likely to reject the statement, as he will not have such feeling.

TABLE 7.7

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 26

' I have had periods of days, weeks or months
when I couldn't take care of things because
I couldn't get going. '

Frequency Distribution of Scores

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	10	9	1
Police	2	7	9	2
Norm Group	3	9	6	2
	5	26	24	5

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.55	0.826	Pro/Pol t = 0	N.S.
Probation	2.55	0.605	Pro/N t = 0.84	N.S.
Norm Group	2.35	0.875	Pol/N t = 0.74	N.S.

There is no significant difference when comparing the mean scores obtained by the three sample groups. However, surprisingly, the writer finds that more subjects in the norm group share this feeling of moodiness.

D. AGRESSION

As it has already been discussed previously, an obvious characteristic of delinquent is the acting out of his "inner conflicts". So a youngster who is emotionally unstable is likely to relieve his emotion tension through acting out behaviour. This acting out behaviour is mostly in aggression. Question No. 6 is based on this assumption.

TABLE 7.8

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 6

' At times, I feel like smashing things. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	8	10	1
Police	1	5	10	4
Norm Group	0	6	9	5
	2	19	29	10

Statistical Ana;ysos of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>		<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.85	0.813	Pro/Pol	t = 1.26	N.S.
Probation	2.55	0.686	Pro/N	t = -1.75	N.S.
Norm Group	2.95	0.759	Pol/N	t = -0.4	N.S.

There is no significant difference among the findings of the three comparison groups. However, data

collected indicated that subjects in the probation group will more likely act out thier aggressopm than the subjects in the police and the norm gorup.

E. ANXIETY

Anxiety is a typical symptom of an emotionally unstable person. Smart pointed out that many offenders receiving psychological treatment are acutely anxious. He further explained that they felt anxious because they felt "in a mass", "all mixed up", "unable to live as he would like to live" or "unable to settle down".⁶²

Basing on these symptoms, Question No.1 and No.12 are included in the adjustment scale.

⁶²Frances Smart, Op. cit., p. 76

TABLE 7.9
RESPONSES OF QUESTION No.1

' I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.'

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	0	9	8	3
Police	1	5	13	1
Norm Group	0	6	13	1
	1	20	34	5

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.7	0.657	Pro/Pol t =-0.2174	N.S.
Probation	2.75	0.786	Pro/N t = 0	N.S.
Norm Group	2.75	0.55	Pol/N t =-0.2632	N.S.

In analysing the above data, no significant difference is found among the three sample groups, although slightly more subjects in the probation group give negative responses.

TABLE 7.10

RESPONSES OF QUESTION No. 12

' I have periods of such great restlessness
that I cannot sit long on a chair. '

Frequency Distribution of Responses

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Probation	1	10	8	1
Police	2	11	7	0
Norm Group	2	8	8	2
	5	29	23	3

Statistical Analysis of Scores

	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>t VALUE</u>	<u>P.</u>
Police	2.3	0.657	Pro/Pol t = -0.7142	N.S.
Probation	2.45	0.686	Pro/N t = -0.2083	N.S.
Norm Group	2.5	0.827	Pol/N t = -0.85	N.S.

The above data also indicate that the subjects of the three sample groups response similarly to Question No. 12. However, more subjects in the police sample group show restlessness than the other two sample groups.

SUMMARY

The overall findings show that there is no significant difference in the three comparison groups on the state of emotional stability. However, in many occasions, the subjects in the norm group obtained a higher score than the members of the other two sample groups. The probation sample group, comparatively speaking, also obtains a higher score than the police sample group. Again, such difference is, in fact, rather small and is not **at** statistical significant level.

Judging from the results of the above assessments, the degree of emotional stability of the subjects in the three comparison groups are more or less the same. The accumulative scores for emotional stability that are presented in the following table also indicate a similar result.

TABLE 7.11

SCORES FOR THE ADJUSTMENT SCALE FOR EMOTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

	Mean and Standard Deviation			Significance*		
	Police (n=20)	Probation (n=20)	Norm (n=20)	Police vs Probation	Probation vs Norm	Police vs Norm
\bar{X}	27.45	27.4	28.85	t=-0.05	t=-1.79	t=-1.4
S.D.	(3.873)	(2.503)	(2.254)	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

* All t-test of group means differences are two tailed. Differences not significant at 0.05 level or better are indicated as N.S.

To conclude, the finding indicates that the two treatment programmes have similar effect in helping their clients in emotional adjustment problems. In other words, the sub-hypothesis (H_d) is accepted.

CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

I. IMPLICATIONS

In the present investigation, the writer has tried to compare the effectiveness of the Probation Treatment Programme and the Police Discretionary Scheme in dealing with fresh offenders. The comparative effectiveness is measured in terms of the differences in their clients' social adjustment. A series of variables concerning social adjustment have been identified and are classified into four general categories: namely, family relationships, social relationships, conformity and emotional stability. Judging from the findings, several implications can be drawn.

Firstly, on the basis of statistical analysis of the collected data, the general hypothesis stating that the Probation Treatment Programme and the Police Discretionary Scheme are equally effective in helping the fresh offenders to achieve social adjustment is supported. This is because when comparing the adjustment scores obtained from the

offenders under study, the writer finds that their responses towards adjustment in family relationships, social relationships conformity and emotional stability are more or less the same. Though in some occasions that the respondents of the probation treatment group tends to give a higher score than that of the police treatment group, the difference is so small that it falls behind the statistical significant level. In other words, we may consider such differences happen only by chance. In this connection, the result of the finding implies that the two treatment programmes under study are equally effective in dealing with fresh offender although their treatment methods differs from each other.

Secondly, though the above findings have indicated that the effects of the two treatment programmes are more or less the same, we do not know whether such treatments have made any improvement. However, when comparing the adjustment scores of the two treatment groups with the non-offender group, the writer finds that there is no significant difference in their adjustment to family relationships, social relationships and emotional stability. This may imply that the offenders in the two treatment programmes have made positive adjustment in these areas.

However, in the area of conformity the analysis of the data shows that neither the police nor the probation sample group have reached the desirable standard. The adjustment to social norm of the subjects in the two treatment groups are significantly worse than the non-offenders. Further analysis of the data shows that the subjects of the two treatment groups are found significantly less conform to regulation and authority when they are compared with the non-offender group. One possible explanation for this finding is that the two treatment programmes are not very effective in helping the offenders to conform with societal norms. As an alternative, the writer wonders if punitive treatment method can bring a better effect to this area of adjustment.

Thirdly, though the exprobationers are placed under the supervision of professional social workers, the finding shows that their social adjustment after treatment are in no way better than the offenders placed under the supervision of a police who has no special training in counselling. This suggests that if the cost of the treatment programme is also taken into consideration, the police treatment programme is more efficient than the probation treatment programme. Along with this line of

thinking, there should be wider use of Police discretionary scheme in handling fresh offenders while probation officers should concentrate themselves on dealing with more deep-rooted cases in which professional counselling are indispensable. Another factor that also favours the use of the Police Discretionary Scheme is that the fresh offenders can be exempted from the painful court experience and the criminal record. As a result, if the negative effect of court experience and criminal record are taken into consideration, the police treatment programme is a more preferable measure in handling fresh offenders.

II. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

There are, however, a number of important limitations in this study. In order to alert the readers to the necessary caution in considering the implications of the findings, these limitations merit at least a brief discussion at this point.

Firstly, the most salient question for consideration is the offenders under study. Owing to the lack of time and manpower, subjects in the sample group are chosen by specific selection other than the random sampling of the whole

population. The cases are only drawn from one district and since the sample size is comparatively small, no generalization can be made. Greater generalizability must wait upon extension and replication of the present effort.

The second major limitation concerns with the fact that the validity and the reliability of the adjustment scale constructed in the present study. Although two pretests have been carried out prior to its implementation, the sample size of the pretests are too small to provide validity and reliability for the measuring instrument. Bias may arise from the subjects' responses to the adjustment scale. Owing to the fact that Chinese are mostly conservative, especially when they are approached by strangers, their choices may be influenced by their desire to please or to be socially acceptable. They may have a tendency to give only moderate responses, or to agree with all statements, or attempt to provide answers that are acceptable rather than truth. So, further test is suggested to ensure the validity and reliability of the present finding. However, since it is only a pilot study, the present effort can serve as a stepping stone for more sophisticated investigation.

A third shortcoming is that there are comparatively few violent offenders in the treatment sample while the subjects selected are predominantly offenders committing crime such as petty theft. So, the finding cannot stand for a complete picture in the treatment for fresh offenders.

Owing to the relatively small population size, the inability to match precisely the subjects in the comparison groups is a further limitation that worths mentioning. The subjects of the two comparison groups are only matched in terms of an over-all distributions of factors chosen within both groups, rather than individual by individual. Furthermore, precise family income of the respondents are not available. Nevertheless, the over-all matching of group is considered fairly adequate.

Another additional weakness which the writer regrets very much is the failure of obtaining a control group. The non-offenders comparison group in the present study cannot serve as a control group because they are not offenders. They need no treatment and have not undergone any treatment programme. So, the purpose of including this group in the study limits to the establishment

of a standard of social adjustment rather than a yardstick to measure the impact of the treatment effect.

Another shortcoming of the present study is the possibility that the fresh offenders in the police treatment group are less deviant than the probation treatment group. However, the strongest argument to defend this shortcoming is that the admission criteria for both probation treatment and Police Discretionary Scheme are more or less the same. The offenders are both delinquents who are not yet deep-rooted in deviance and that they have a genuine desire to reform. Furthermore, these offenders are both considered to be in need of some sort of guidance other than what they have already been given by their parents. Presently, there is no pre-determined guideline for the placement of these offenders into these two different treatment programmes. In actual practice, if the victim does not want to prosecute the offender, the latter will then be placed under Police Discretionary Scheme. Otherwise, he may be brought up to court and may be placed under probation.

The last but not least limitation of the present study is the writer's inability to control the quality of

of treatment. Owing to the fact that there are frequent change of supervising officers and the case load is very heavy, the probation officers are unable to render adequate professional services. As a result, there is a possibility that the input of both treatment programmes are in actual practice resemble to each other.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

Though this pilot study has failed to reject the null hypothesis by statistically significant results, there are several achievements. Firstly, if the costs of the treatment programmes are taken into consideration, the result obtained in this study indicates that there will be both financial and social advantages in expanding the use of the Police Discretionary Scheme in dealing with fresh juvenile offenders. In terms of financial benefit, the cost is much lower to have a police constable taking care of a juvenile fresh offender than a probation officer. Furthermore, a wider use of the Police Discretionary Scheme will also save the time, manpower and cost of the court because many offences now appear in court are too insignificant to deserve formal court procedure. Time and manpower may be better spent in giving a more adequate hearing to more serious cases.

As for the social benefit, since the offenders placed on the Police Discretionary Scheme will spare the pain court experience, there will be no social stigma.

This psychological factor which has direct impact on one's self concept will significantly influence the rehabilitation and adjustment of a fresh offender in the society.

Secondly, lessons learnt from this study suggests that the effort to develop postprogramme measures must be increased if we want to improve the existing collectional service. The above findings have clearly indicated that there is a possibility that the existing treatment programmes for fresh offenders are not fully utilized. For example, the Police Discretionary Scheme may deserve some expansion while the probation treatment programme may make more contribution if it concentrates its effort in handling deep-rooted offenders. One way to find a more definite answer for this is to develop certain before and after tests which will be more valid gauges to assess treatment effect.

The present study has been the first of its kind in Hong Kong to investigate the comparative effects of treatment programmes for fresh offenders. The implications that derived from this project, although far from being conclusive, have suggested certain directions to which future investigation may head. The writer sincerely hopes that the present effort can be able to invite replication on

a larger scale, say, having all the cases of the two treatment programmes in Hong Kong as the study population, so that a more definite answer can be found.

APPENDIXE ONEQUESTIONNAIRE

I am a student of the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

We are now conducting a social research on the youth problem.

The purpose of the present visit is to obtain your opinion on some life situation. There are no right or wrong answers for the questions we are going to make, so we hope you can answer as the way you look at things. We hope that you can co-operate with us in responding to our questions and all the information you provide us will be kept strictly confidential.

<u>Strongly</u>				<u>Strongly</u>
<u>Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>		<u>Disagree</u>

(1) I find it hard to keep my mind
on a task or job.

(2) I am often involved in family
disputes.

(3) When I am moody, like to start
a fight with other people to
get me over my depression.

(4) When I run into trouble, my
siblings don't give me help.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
(5)My family members usually accept my suggestions.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(6)At times I feel like smashing things.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(7)I think I should spend all the money that I have earn myself.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(8)I dress up for a party even when I hate to do so.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(9)Most of the time I feel blue.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(10)My home is a very harmonious place.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(11)If I am in trouble, I seek assistance from a friend.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(12)I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long on a chair.	_____	_____	_____	_____

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
(13)When my parents are strict with me, I understand they do it for my own good.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(14)When the police are chasing after a thief, I would like to see the thief escapes.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(15)No one seems to understand me.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(16)It is more enjoyable to see a picture together with a friend than alone.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(17)It seems that I am the most unwanted child in my family.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(18)I can stand on my own feet and thus need no parental guidance.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(19)When other people are around, I usually feel very nervous.	_____	_____	_____	_____

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
(20) At times I have very much wanted to leave home.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(21) I line up, and wait at a bus stop even if I am in a hurry.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(22) My daily life is full of things that keep me interested.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(23) If my neighbour is robbed, I'll ring up the police immediately.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(24) I enjoy having leisure activities with my siblings during holidays.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(25) My parents always find faults with me and they do not understand me.	_____	_____	_____	_____

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
(26) I have had periods of days, weeks, or months when I couldn't take care of things because I couldn't 'get going'.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(27) I can trust my parents in everything.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(28) In a public park, we will pick the flowers unattended by the gardener.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(29) My parents say and do things that make me feel that I am not trusted.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(30) In group activity, I prefer to sit alone.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(31) When my parents nag, I find their nagging helpful.	_____	_____	_____	_____

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
(32) I like getting along with neighbours.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(33) When I have a disagree -ment with my family members, they usually solve the problem with me through discussion.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(34) I prefer to work all by myself than to work together with others.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(35) I like doing things different from others.	_____	_____	_____	_____
(36) If there is no doorkeeper at the entrance, I can just walk in the theater and see the picture without buying a ticket.	_____	_____	_____	_____

問卷

我是中文大學的學生，我們現在正進行一個有關青少年問題的研究，今次我來探訪你，目的是想知道青年人對生活上一些問題的看法和意見，我們所問的問題，並沒有一定的答案，所以希望你能夠按照自己的意見回答，你所填寫的答案，我們會絕對保守秘密的，多謝你的合作。

	非常同意	同意	不同意	非常不同意
1. 我覺得很難專心於一件工作或職務上。	—	—	—	—
2. 我常常和家人吵架。	—	—	—	—
3. 當我心情不好時，我會故意和人打架去出氣。	—	—	—	—
4. 當我有困難時，我的兄弟姐妹都不會幫我。	—	—	—	—
5. 我家人常常都會接納我的主意。	—	—	—	—
6. 有時我真想摔東西。	—	—	—	—
7. 當我做工時所賺得的錢全由自己使用。	—	—	—	—
8. 雖然我喜歡衣著隨便，不過如有宴會時，我依然會穿著得整整齊齊。	—	—	—	—
9. 我時常覺得很悲觀。	—	—	—	—

非常不同意

不同意

同意

非常同意

10. 我的家是一個很舒適的地方。

11. 如果我遇到有困難，我會找我的朋友幫忙。

12. 我有些時候太過煩躁，在椅上多坐一會也不行。

13. 當我父母對我很嚴厲時，我明白他們是為我好的。

14. 當警察捉賊時，我會希望賊人走脫。

15. 好像沒有人會了解我。

16. 自己一個人去看電影總比不上和朋友一齊去那麼開心。

17. 在家裏，我似乎是位最不受歡迎的人。

18. 我已經能夠自立，不需要父母管束。

19. 當我和一班人在一起，我會覺得很緊張。

20. 有時我很想離家出走。

21. 就是我有急事要趕乘巴士，我仍然會排隊等車。

22. 我的日常生活中，充滿著使我感興趣的事情。

23. 如果我都屈被人打劫，我會立刻報警。

24. 放假時，我很喜歡和兄弟姊妹一齊去玩。

非常不同意

不同意

同意

非常同意

25. 我的父母時常說我做錯事，其實他們不了解我。

26. 我曾一連幾天，幾個星期，幾個月一事無成，原因就是總提不起勁來。

27. 無論什麼事，我都可以信任我的父母。

28. 我們可以摘取公園裏沒有花王看管的花朵。

29. 我父母平日對我的態度，令我覺得他們不信任我。

30. 在集體活動時，我喜歡靜靜地坐在一旁觀看。

31. 我覺得父母對我的教訓是很有幫助的。

32. 我很喜歡和鄰居交往。

33. 當我和家人意見不同時，他們會和我平心靜氣地商量。

34. 我做事喜歡自己一個人獨力完成工作。

35. 我喜歡做一些與眾不同的事情。

36. 如果戲院入口沒有收票員，我們便可以不用買戲票入戲院。

Letter to the Respondents

The Probation & Correction Division,
Social Welfare Department,
Lee Garden, 4th Floor,
Hysan Avenue, Hong Kong.

Dear Mr/Miss X,

The Social Welfare Department, at the request of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, is assisting in research on youth problems, so as to improve the existing service. This research needs your co-operation in giving your opinion on certain questions. All the information obtained shall be kept strictly confidential. In this connection, a student, Mr. _____, Student card No. 878130, from The Chinese University of Hong Kong shall call at your home on _____ for an interview. Your kind co-operation would be much appreciated. If that time is inconvenient to you, kindly phone up Miss Ma, during office hour, at telephone No. _____ for another appointment. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Head

Probation & Correction Division.

逕啟者：本署應中文大學之要求，協助進行
一項有關青年人問題之研究，希能藉此改善
有關之服務。此項研究乃極須閣下之合作，對
某些問題提供一些意見，所得之一切資料皆絕
對保密。現將有一位中文大學之學生於 月 日
午 時 分到府上探訪，其姓名是楊元安，
學生證號碼是八七八一三〇。屆時希能秉誠合作。

此致

君

社會福利署感化組謹啟 月 日



SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abrahamsen, David. The Psychology of Crime. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1960.
2. Babst, D.V. and Mannering J.W. "Probation Vs Imprisonment FOR Similar Types of Offenders - A Comparison BY Subsequent Violation." Journal of Research IN Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 2, 1965.
3. Bandura, A. and Walters, R.H. Adolescent Aggression. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1959.
4. Bennett, Ivy. Delinquent and Neurotic Children - A Comparative Study. Tavistock Publication Ltd., 1960.
5. Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1960.
6. Broom, Leonard and Selzinck, Philip, Sociology: a text with adapted readings. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. 1963.
7. Caldwell, M.G. "Review of a New Type of Probation Study made in Alabama." Federal Probation, June, 1951.
8. Davies, Martin. Probationers in Their Social Environment. London: H.M.S.O., 1969.
9. England, Ralph W. "A Study of Postprobation Recidivism Among Five Hundred Federal Offenders." Federal Probation, September, 1955.
10. Friedlander, Kate. The Psycho-analytic Approach to Juvenile Delinquency. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1947.
11. Gold, Martin. "Crime and Delinquency: Control and Prevention." Encyclopedia of Social Work. N.A.S.W. Inc., 1971.
12. Halmos, Paul. The Sociological Review, Monograph No.9: Sociological Studies in the British Penal Services. Keele: University of Keele, 1965.
13. Hammond, W.H. The Sentence of the Court: A Handbook for Sentencers. London: H.M.S.O., 1969.

14. Hood, Roger and Sparks, Richard. Key Issues in Criminology.
London: World University Library, 1970.
15. Lethbridge, H.J. "Penal Policy and Crime Rate: Commen on
the Hong Kong Experience." Hong Kong Law Journal.
No. 2, 1972.
16. Martin, John B. "The Saginaw Project." Crime and Delinquency.
Vol. 6, 1960.
17. Moser, C.A. and Kalton, G. Survey Methods in Social
Investigation. 2nd edition, London: Heinemann
Educational Books Ltd. 1971.
18. Nearing, Scott. Social Adjustment. New York: The macmillian
Company, 1911.
19. Ng, Agnes. Social Causes of Violent Crime Among Young
Offenders in Hong Kong. Hong Kong: Social
Research Center, The Chinese University of
Hong Kong, 1974.
20. Nye, F.I. Family Relationship and Delinquent Behavior
New York: Wiley and Sons, 1958.
21. Polansky, N.A. (ed.), Social Work Research. Revised Edition
Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
22. probation & Corrections Division, Social Welfare Department,
A Survey on Exprobationers in Hong Kong: to
Evaluate their success rates one year after
satisfactory completion of their terms of Prbation.
1973. (Mimeogtaphed.)
23. Radizinowicz, L. ed. The Result of Probation - A report of
the Cambridge Department of Criminal Service
London: Macmillian & Co.Ltd., 1958,
24. Reckless, Walter C. and Dinitz, Simon. The Prevention
of Juvenile Delinquency: An Expreiment. Columbus:
Ohio University Press, 1972.
25. Rose, G and Hamilton, R.A. "Effect of a Juvenile Liaison
Scheme." British Journal Of Criminology. Vol.10
1970
26. Rumney, J. and Murphy, J.P. Probation and Social Adjustment.
New Brunswick: Rutger University Press, 1952.

27. Smith, Alexander B. and Bassin, Alexander, "Research in a Probation Department" Crime and Delinquency. Vol.8, 1962.
28. Sugg, Michael L. Adolescent Aggression in Hong Kong. Hong Kong: Social Research Center, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1975.
29. Turabian, Kate L. A manual for Writer of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations, 3rd. ed. Revised. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969.
30. Wilkins, L.T. "A Small Comparative Study of the Result of Probation." British Journal of Delinquency. Vol.8 1958.



000954994